Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

https://archive.org/details/characterofjesus0002drda

THE

CHARACTER OF JESUS PORTRAYED.

A BIBLICAL ESSAY,

WITH AN APPENDIX.

BY DR. DANIEL SCHENKEL,
PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, HEIDELBERG.

"The one, special, and deepest theme of the history of the world and of mankind, to which all else is subordinated, is always the conflict of scepticism and faith."
GOETHE.

TRANSLATED FROM THE THIRD GERMAN EDITION,
WITH INTRODUCTION AND NOTES,
BY
W. H. FURNESS, D.D.

VOL. II.

THE CINCINNATI BIBLE SEMINARY
LIBRARY

BOSTON:
LITTLE, BROWN, AND COMPANY.
1866.

232.9
S324c
v.2

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1866, by
LITTLE, BROWN, AND COMPANY,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

32915

UNIVERSITY PRESS: WELCH, BIGELOW, & CO.,
CAMBRIDGE.

CONTENTS OF VOL. II.

FOURTH SECTION.

THE MESSIAH.

Chap.		Page
XI.	The growing Opposition	1
XII.	The Messianic Destination	11
XIII.	The Transfiguration of the Person of Jesus	36
XIV.	Higher Teaching	49
XV.	Before the Departure for the final Conflict	64

FIFTH SECTION.

SPHERE OF ACTION IN JUDEA.

XVI.	The School of Endurance	78
XVII.	The true Means of Virtue	93
XVIII.	The Calling of the Gentiles	107
XIX.	Final Instruction of the Disciples . .	121

SIXTH SECTION.

THE CRISIS.

XX.	The Old Temple and the New	153
XXI.	The Old State and the New	173
XXII.	The Woe pronounced upon the Hierarchical Party	187
XXIII.	The Future of the Kingdom of God . .	202

SEVENTH SECTION.

THE CONSUMMATION.

XXIV. The Consecration by anointing . . . 216
XXV. The Supper 230
XXVI. Gethsemane 249
XXVII. The Trial 266
XXVIII. The Crucifixion 286
XXIX. The Glorified 303

APPENDIX.

Critical and Historical Illustrations 329

FOURTH SECTION.

THE MESSIAH.

CHAPTER XI.

THE GROWING OPPOSITION.

1. The declaration of Jesus that his person was the true bread of heaven, and that his body and blood were the imperishable food, produced an unfavorable impression upon many who had been drawn to his side. As the fourth Gospel states, a number of his disciples, but none of the Twelve, upon hearing these sayings left him. He had never before said so plainly that those who attached themselves to his cause must like him renounce all worldly enjoyments and sacrifice themselves for their country and mankind.

He himself, after the efforts and fatigue of the last few days, felt the urgent need of retiring once more into solitude,[1] in order in still prayer and fervent communion with God to repair his strength for new labors. He took none of his disciples with him this time, but sent them by the lake to Bethsaida, not following them himself until towards nightfall.[2] And here there is a legend of a new and if possible greater miracle even than the multiplication of the loaves. Jesus is said to have walked upon the lake. Even in its

[1] Mark vi. 45; Matt. xiv. 22.

[2] Mark vi. 48; Matt. xiv. 25; John vi. 17.

obscurity the story is not without one feature genuinely historical. In the vessel sailing for Bethsaida were those very disciples who, offended at the words of Jesus, had refused to follow him any longer. Is it wonderful that in the dim night their Master pacing the shore seemed to them like a threatening apparition startling their consciences?[1] Before these men, who had just weakly broken the sacred tie that bound them to him, the form of Jesus loomed like an avenging spirit from a higher world.

In fact, from this time forward divisions began to arise, more and more strongly marked, among those who had gathered around Jesus. Even among the Twelve there was one whose expectations he was becoming every moment less able to satisfy and who could hardly conceal his bitter disappointment. That gloomy thoughts began to awaken now and then within the selecter circle of disciples, is stated not only by the fourth Gospel but also by the second.[2] Had the miraculous multiplication of the bread actually taken place this state of things would be inexplicable. Jesus is said in the exercise of divine Omnipotence to have wrought that miracle before the eyes of all, and the disciples who witnessed the incredible event had not perceived it! "Their hearts were hardened." They had just returned from their missionary journey, animated by attendant signs and their consequences, and the "crowning miracle" of all the miracles yet wrought by Jesus is represented as having made no impression on them! Tradition has here evidently misplaced the essential fact. Had the miracle of the multiplication of the loaves really taken place before all eyes as is re-

[1] Mark vi. 49; Matt. xiv. 26; John vi. 19.

[2] Mark vi. 52. See also Mark viii. 7; Matt. xvi. 9.

lated, it must have made an ineffaceable impression upon all; Jesus must then have appeared to all present as a divine being, and no higher sign of his authority would have been required of him. There was nothing hard to be apprehended in such a miracle, for every child could have grasped it in his hand. But what was not apprehended by many, what their hearts were not touched by, was the doctrine of the "heavenly bread of life." At this point it became plain for the first time to not a few that no earthly rewards and honors, but only spiritual blessings, moral benefits, were to proceed from him. To gifts of this kind most were indifferent. They would have miracles; they would fain eat bread from heaven. They expected compensation for their devotion to Jesus. They looked upon him as a magician. By touching his garments, not by communion with his spirit, they wished to be healed.[1] This craving for deliverance from mere physical evil convinced Jesus more and more of the worldly and selfish dispositions of the people. Many of the sick became well, as we can readily imagine in consequence of mental excitement, through a transient exaltation of their spirits. But Jesus had come to save sinners, not to render physicians unnecessary; and of any earnest and penetrating need of moral and religious renovation there appeared only a few signs here and there.

2. So much the more did Jesus feel himself bound to lay ever increasing stress upon the moral demands made upon those whom he called. There was an especial want of moral earnestness with reference particularly to the fundamental condition of all moral ability in the people: the education of the people for

[1] Mark vi. 56; Matt. xiv. 36.

moral freedom. The principles of this freedom he had already announced in his dedicatory discourse; his disciples on their journeyings had put these principles into practice. But how hard it was for them to free themselves from prescriptive prejudices and the yoke of Jewish authority, was daily shown by new instances of the confusion of their minds, of their wavering motives and acts.

Since the establishment of an association of disciples Jesus had broken with the theocracy. It was necessary that the rupture should be in fact still more decisive. The Jewish theologues of the Pharisaical party had, in their pedantic passion for a religion of the letter and for ruling consciences, killed the moral sense in the sphere in which they took the lead. They had disabled the sense of freedom, moral, spiritual, religious. The people for the most part were governed by them, and they were popularly accounted the most zealous and venerable champions of the sacred Law handed down from the fathers. Very soon after his first appearance in public, these spiritual leaders had recognized in Jesus the representative of a spirit and manner of life the opposite of theirs. That their influence was gone if the God's kingdom announced by him should be realized, was a point upon which they could not deceive themselves. They were resolved to anticipate the threatening danger. What measures they took for the purpose we have already shown. Up to this time, however, Jesus had made no direct attack upon them. He whom they had been lying in wait for, and who was the object of their assaults, had thus far kept within the line of self-defence. It now became necessary that this state of things should be changed. By simply answering their suspicions and calumnies he had not

yet been able to silence the hierarchical party. He had now to show that these men were in the path of error, that they misled the people and were actuated by an ungodly spirit, and that theirs was an ignorant zeal.

A renewed attack on their part led him now to assume the offensive. The point of time was not ill-chosen by the hierarchical party. There was strife among the immediate adherents of Jesus; the "party of the heavenly kingdom" seemed to be divided in itself.

Among his disciples Jesus had condemned as external and leading to hypocrisy the Pharisaical means of virtue. He had emphatically set aside the Levitical washings and purifications, and with them had necessarily abolished certain legal definitions of the old Covenant.[1] The Pharisees, therefore, as the representatives of the traditional faith, could object to Jesus with a certain appearance of justice that the religion of the fathers was held by him among his disciples in light esteem. They required him to defend himself against this charge, and his defence was an open declaration of war against Pharisaism and against the hierarchy which was identified therewith. False righteousness and true, the piety of the Law and the piety of faith, — these were the great irreconcilable opposites that now sharply confronted each other. For the first time, Jesus styled the Pharisees hypocrites.[2] For the first time, he laid bare before them the root of the hereditary sin of the hierarchists: the hidden self-deception of spiritual pride, by which, in deceiving others, one deceives himself. The language of Jesus is aimed, not at the falseness and deceit of individual members

[1] Levit. xv. 1 – 15. [2] Mark vii. 6; Matt. xv. 7.

of the party, but at the party itself, at its principles, its modes of moral help, its methods, its ultimate aims. The Pharisees, the hierarchs, were pious, very pious in outward appearance. The prescribed statute was observed in the strictest manner. In their traditional doctrine, in their religious observances, they were all right. But the distinguishing mark of this righteousness is described by Isaiah:[6] they draw nigh to God with the mouth, they honor Him with their lips, but they are cold, dull, gross towards Him at heart. Duties not dictated from within, but acquired, human inventions, — such was the seal of their faith and their practice. In this attack upon the Pharisees, how vividly does Jesus portray an outward, creed-bound, dead, senseless ecclesiasticism! "Ye make of none effect the commandment of God, and hold to the traditions of men: ye wash platters and cups, and upon things of this sort lay the greatest stress. This is your whole piety!" How keen and cutting this annihilating irony! But what flames of wrath must have been kindled in the hearts of those at whom this deadly blow was struck!

After such an utterance, there was the most urgent occasion for Jesus to give his disciples a deeper insight into the Pharisaic theology and its ruinous moral influence. In so doing his opposition to the Pharisees was rendered still more marked than ever. These disclosures of Jesus to his disciples the first Evangelist has interwoven into the Sermon on the Mount, and consequently withdrawn them from their proper connection. The chief point upon which Jesus dwelt was the contrast between the law of God and the commandments of men, between that which is in and of itself eternally true, good and holy, and that which is invested with

[1] Isaiah xxix. 13.

the authority of truth and right by the arbitrary pleasure of man. Jesus premised his statements, probably, with a general remark concerning his relation to the Old Testament law. Not to the eternal spirit and substance of this law was he opposed. He had departed only from the ceremonial portion of it, the hierarchical institutes, the later theological requirements. For himself, he had long before not only allowed the ceremonial law to go unobserved, he had set aside the Sabbath law enforced in the Decalogue. Nevertheless in the moral precepts of the Old Testament he recognized an expression, eternally valid, of the holy will of God, — an indestructible bond between the Old Covenant and the New. For he declared that "he had not come to destroy the law and the prophets but to fulfil them."[1] While he thus distinctly announced his purpose to fulfil the Old Testament, he yet as plainly intimated that it did not in and of itself contain the full truth. He could not possibly have said therefore that not a jot, not a tittle of the Old Testament is to pass away, and that whoso destroys the least commandment of the Old Covenant will be called the least in the kingdom of heaven.[2] On the contrary, he passes for the least in the kingdom of heaven who like the Baptist abolishes no jot of the law. Jesus has not destroyed the "Law and the prophets," i. e. the Old Testament dispensation; but particular requirements, and above all their literal observance he has of necessity destroyed, since he had actually done this already in regard to fastings and purifications, and most especially in regard to the Sabbatical law. That passage, therefore, in the first Gos-

[1] Matt. v. 17.

[2] Matt. v. 18, 19; Luke xvi. 17. See Appendix, Ill. 15, p. 7.

pel is a later addition of the Palestinean tradition: a mistaken inference of the Jewish Christian party from those words of Jesus, unquestionably genuine, in which he states that he had come, not for destruction, but for fulfilment.

What he meant by this fulfilment he explained by a series of examples. His idea is not indeed that the Old Testament dispensation contains all that he unfolded from it, for in this case there could be no talk of fulfilling it. On the contrary, his conviction was that, in the light of the new Covenant, the Old Testament dispensation was in itself no longer of use, that now the right import was to be given to it. The kingdom of heaven, according to the Old Testament, was external, resting entirely upon enactments, statutes, and the force of law, so that its commands and prohibitions had reference to the outward behavior of men, to legal obedience. The New Testament kingdom of God is within, spiritual, reposing upon individual freedom, on which account its precepts have relation to the inner state of men, to their moral dispositions. Under the Old Covenant murder was forbidden; under the New, we are warned against being angry, because from anger may come murder. Under the Old Covenant the offering, made in accordance with the rules prescribed, is in itself an expiation; in the New Covenant the offering has no atoning efficacy, unless made with an expiatory and reconciled spirit of mind. In the Old Covenant adultery was forbidden, but only as an act; in the New even a look of sensual desire cast upon the wife of another is accounted adultery. Thus the members of the New Testament kingdom of God must, above all things, resist the tempting thought, the root of sin, and not wait till the evil act

has sprung out of it.[1] So likewise with oaths. According to the Old Covenant, only false swearing, perjury, is forbidden; to swear truly by God is permitted.[2] In the New Covenant, swearing is condemned altogether, only the simple affirmation of truth is lawful; thus even official oaths are prohibited.[3] The righteousness of the Pharisees was satisfied with the correct observance of the letter of the Law; whosoever failed not in this was a righteous man before God. The disposition of the mind, the consecration of the soul was, according to this standard, a matter of indifference. For this reason it engendered and nourished hypocrisy. Whosoever maintains the appearance of righteousness before men, and keeps himself from being convicted of a transgression of the law, fulfils the commandment of God, in the estimation of the Pharisees. Thus Pharisaism undermined the conscience, killed religion and morality at their roots. Under its influence all moral earnestness died away, and the marrow of the life and strength of the people perished. It was the religion of appearances, and had the morality of a specious superficiality. It was the lean and Jesuitical pietism of the world before Christ. Under the pretence of honoring, it dishonored the commandment of God. God's commandment is, Honor thy father and thy mother.[4] The Pharisaic Law, on the contrary, permitted the child to give to the Temple and its uses what he might devote to the support of his parents, and thus the obligation to honor one's parents was made of no effect. Pharisaism neutralized God's eternal law by the inventions of man, and put

[1] Matt. v. 27–30.
[2] Levit. xix. 12.
[3] Matt. v. 33.
[4] Exod. xx. 12. See Mark vii. 10; Matt. xv. 5.

imaginations, depraved desires which, springing up within, would have no evil deeds for consequences, were they not indulged and suffered to grow strong.

The effect produced by this naked portraiture of their theology was so great in the Pharisaic and hierarchical circles, that Jesus felt himself compelled to quit Galilee for a time. The opposition to him was increased greatly, but he became in consequence still more profoundly conscious of his destined calling.

CHAPTER XII.

THE MESSIANIC DESTINATION.

1. Up to this hour Jesus had confined the sphere of his labors to his own countrymen. The only exception to this course was the healing of a Gentile slave in Capernaum, and this exception had been made at the intercession of the elders of the Jewish synagogue, and for favor shown to the Jewish Church by the master of the slave. Restoration of the true Israel, — this was the first aim of Jesus. But in the idea of the kingdom of God morally conceived of, there lay a germ which must needs cause it to expand beyond the narrow precincts of the Jewish population. A kingdom of the Spirit, a kingdom of Truth and Righteousness and Love, having its seat in the inner being of man, is limited by no outward statutes, depends upon no traditions, no forms or formulas, belongs to no one people, but to humanity itself. No doubt the flame of a holy love of country glowed in the bosom of the Deliverer, no doubt his heart beat warmly for his own country-

men first of all, led astray as they were by blind leaders; no doubt it was his unquestioning conviction that the nucleus of the new order of things which he was establishing must be formed among the Jews. But the more deeply he penetrated into the idea of the kingdom of God, and the clearer his consciousness became of his calling as a liberator of Israel, the more fully was he convinced that from the Jewish hierarchy and theology only the deadliest hostility to the great work of his life was to be expected; the more deeply was he impressed with the necessity of extending his views beyond the boundaries of Israel in order that the conversion of the Gentile world might be brought into ever nearer prospect. The last conflict with the Pharisees appears to have given special occasion for such a conclusion.

Jesus first betook himself to that part of Phœnicia bordering upon Palestine, and lying near the sea. He appears, although only in a passing way, to have visited several cities, Sidon especially.[1] We cannot call this excursion a missionary journey precisely. The purpose of Jesus was to learn somewhat of the religious condition and susceptibility of the Gentiles. He desired for this reason to see them as they were, and to make his observations undisturbed;[2] in this, however, he did not entirely succeed. The report of him had already extended to Phœnicia. A Gentile woman discovered who he was and implored his help for her daughter, suffering under a mental disease. Is it to be supposed that on this occasion he really said to his disciples what the first Evangelist reports, that he was not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel?[3]

[1] Mark vii. 24, 31; Matt. xv. 21.
[2] Mark vii. 24.
[3] Matt. xv. 23.

The journey into the Gentile region declares the contrary. Had he not undertaken the journey because his work was beginning to appear to him more and more clearly to embrace all mankind? Hence the older tradition knows nothing of this declaration in favor of Israel.(*a*) But Jesus did use, in speaking to the woman, the harsh word that "the children" (the Jews) must first be fed, and that it was not meet to take the bread from them and give it to "the dogs."[1] This language was the offspring not of the spirit of Jesus, but of the proud and exclusive temper of Phariseedom; it was uttered to test the woman's faith, to ascertain whether she discerned in Jesus one who was in opposition to Pharisaism. Had her rejoinder been angry and defiant, she would not have been worthy of help, for she would have shown herself wanting in the faith fundamental to a right recognition of the character of Jesus. But when with a genuine and instinctive humility she implied that Jesus could not be in earnest, that he could not seriously compare human beings to dogs, that his heart was open to the miseries of even the poor suffering heathen world, Jesus then willingly granted her prayer.

2. After satisfying himself by this excursion of the fitness of the Gentiles to receive the Gospel, Jesus returned by a circuitous route through the region of the ten cities east of the Jordan to the first scene of his labors, to the shores of the Lake of Gennesaret, the country around Capernaum. He found the hostility of the hierarchical party in no wise abated. By new cures he had excited anew the jealousy of the Pharisees, and his journey into Phœnicia, his intercourse with Gentiles, furnished new matter of offence.[2] The second miracu-

[1] Mark vii. 27; Matt. xv. 26. [2] Mark vii. 31; Matt. xv. 29.

lous feeding of the multitude, related by the first two Evangelists in this connection, finds here no fitting place, and betrays itself as a repetition of the incident in the wilderness, which we have already explained. More naturally does the account of a renewed attack upon Jesus by the Pharisees connect itself with the course of events as they have thus far proceeded. His arrest on the score of insanity had failed utterly; the charge of being in league with the Devil had proved too gross. A substantial ground of complaint was above all things to be discovered. Hence he was now watched on all sides, the spies of the watchmen of Zion were everywhere lurking around him. To lay a trap for him, to entangle him in some snare was their ceaseless labor. They trusted that they had at last discovered the means of making his ruin sure. His miracles were after all not so very wonderful. They lacked the signature of his high mission. It was perfectly justifiable to require him, in order to accredit himself, to give a greater, a really heavenly sign. A sign from "heaven," — such was their demand. If he could not give it then he was — unmasked.

This demand is to be fully explained only upon the supposition that the "miracles" of Jesus did not appear to his contemporaries to transcend the limitations of natural laws to the extent to which they are represented as so doing by the written traditions thirty or forty years afterwards. It is worthy of remark that, in replying to this demand, Jesus makes no reference whatever to his miracles. He makes no mention of the evil spirits that he had cast out, or of the blind whom he had restored to sight, or of the lame to whom he had restored the use of their limbs, or of the storms which he had laid, or of the water which he

had turned into wine, or of his feeding multitudes with a few loaves and fishes. And yet these things were "signs" from heaven. According to the second Evangelist, Jesus only sighed deeply and declared that to that generation no sign should be given.[1] He refers his questioners — "hypocrites" as he calls them according to the third Gospel,[2] "this evil and adulterous generation," as he styles them in the first Gospel — rather to the changes in the heavens, to the red of the evening sky by which fair weather is foretold, and to the red of the morning sky which prognosticates storm and rain, and he asks them why they could tell the weather from the signs in the heavens so easily, and yet be unable to discern the divine plan of salvation unfolding at a time whereof the moral and spiritual characteristics all pointed so plainly to the introduction of a new order of things in the kingdom of God?[3] Thus there is nothing here that intimates that the significance of his person and the nature of his work were to be illustrated by miracles. On the contrary he reiterated his injunction to those whom he healed to tell no one what he had done.[4]

According to the first and third Gospels, however, he did speak of a "sign" that should be given to that generation, the sign of the prophet Jonah.[5] As to what he meant by this "sign" the Evangelists do not agree. The first[6] gives an explanation of it entirely at variance with that of the second, stating that the resurrection of Jesus was the sign that would be given to his unbelieving contemporaries to accredit his divine authority. Thus Jesus referred

[1] Mark viii. 11.
[2] Luke xii. 56.
[3] Matt. xvi. 2; Luke xii. 54.
[4] Mark vii. 36.
[5] Matt. xvi. 4; compare xii. 39; Luke xi. 29.
[6] Matt. xii. 40.

his opposers not to a miracle already wrought but only to a future miracle. But it is evident on the face of it that he could not have made any such appeal to his future resurrection as the true heavenly sign of his authority. Never before and to no man yet had he spoken of the violent death awaiting him. Is it conceivable that now, in order to confound his opposers he would refer to his resurrection, which was to follow that event, as a settled thing? Would they not have exulted in such an answer, and taken occasion to rail at him as a boaster and a deceiver? Was the fate of the prophet Jonah to be a striking prophetic indication to his opposers, that he too after severe sufferings and a shameful death would rise again from the dead? But looked at more closely, the fate of the prophet is by no means an appropriate symbol of the resurrection of Jesus. Jesus was not three days and three nights in the grave as Jonah was in the belly of the whale, but only two nights and one day. If then he really made this comparison, he appealed to a prototype not at all appropriate. Besides it is nowhere said in the book of Jonah that the fact of the prophet's being swallowed by the whale was a "sign" of his authority to the Ninevites. It was the preaching of Jonah that was a "sign" to them, warning them that after forty days their city would be overthrown if they did not repent.[1] In the first and third Gospels the true meaning of the "sign" of the prophet Jonah is preserved.[2] As they report, Jesus declares that the Ninevites will rise up in judgment upon this generation and condemn it; for they repented at the preaching of Jonah, but a greater than Jonah is here. Accordingly there is no inconsistency between the declaration of the second Gospel

[1] Jonah iii. 4.

[2] Matt. xii. 41; Luke xi. 32.

that no sign would be given to that generation, and the words reported in the first and third: "there shall be given them the sign of the prophet Jonah." Jesus was seeking to establish the kingdom of truth, righteousness and love, not upon miracles, manifestations of power merely, but upon the free word, upon the evangelical announcement. The Jews desired signs and wonders, instead of which he gave them preaching, but they wilfully turned away with enmity in their hearts. According to the Old Testament tradition Jonah converted the Ninevites by his preaching; the threatened overthrow of their city after forty days was the sign that warned them to turn from their evil ways. But Jesus was greater than Jonah; how much more elevated his personality, how much more powerful his word, how much deeper and richer the fountain of truth from which he drew, how much more intimate his communion with God! And how had the hierarchical party received his preaching? Shameless defamation and malignant opposition, — such was the answer to his gracious appeals.[1] (*b*)

3. The attempt to show Jesus in a disadvantageous light and find in him some cause of complaint had been frustrated again and again. With his wonderful gift Jesus had made no vainglorious boasts, as his enemies had hoped. They were now only the more exasperated against him. They had tried, at least to embarrass him, to expose him to ridicule in the eyes of the people, to win a triumph for their pride at the expense of one whom they feared and hated; and Jesus had put them to shame by his answers at once so modest and so dignified. They had been caught in their own snares. Thus baffled, they were goaded on only the more

[1] See Appendix, III. 16, p. 17.

fiercely in the prosecution of their hostile designs. Feeling that they had the power in their hands, they were only the more bent upon having a swift and bloody revenge. Seeing himself thus menaced, Jesus felt bound to avoid the plots of his enemies by withdrawing to the eastern shore of the Lake. His heart was full and heavily burdened. He was surrounded in the ship by his disciples. They had been the witnesses of his encounter with the Pharisees. They seemed to him to be wanting in the state of mind which what they had just heard and seen should have produced. They evidently were not yet aware of the magnitude of the danger that threatened him from the hierarchical party; and this party was moreover leagued with the Roman party against him. Jesus could not refrain from expressing his dissatisfaction. In reproaching his disciples for their hardness of heart and lack of insight,[1] he does not refer, as the second Gospel assumes, to their insensibility to the miraculous feeding of the multitude. This miracle had not in fact taken place in the manner reported. Jesus reproved them because they were still so little disposed to receive the truth. He chid them for their narrowness of mind and especially for their want of steadfastness and earnestness in view of the conspiracy which the hierarchs and Herodians were forming against him. They ought to have been on their guard "against the leaven of the Pharisees,"[2] against the dangerous influence which hierarchical fanaticism always exercises; we cannot think that it was only against the "doctrine" of the Pharisees and Herodians that Jesus desired to warn his disciples, as the first Gospel imagines.[3] It

[1] Mark viii. 17. [2] Mark viii. 15; Matt. xvi. 6.

[3] Matt. xvi. 12. That the Sadducees are mentioned here, instead

was the whole tone and spirit of these parties, as well as their distinctive views, that exercised the most ruinous influence.

As Jesus, when he left Galilee, had first turned his steps westward toward Phœnicia, he now went northward toward Syria, into the neighborhood of the city of Cæsarea Philippi at the foot of Mount Hermon. He was impressed with the conviction that the decisive hour was at hand, that the important word in regard to the secret of his life must be spoken. His disciples, he felt, must no longer be in doubt as to the ultimate aim of his mission.

He had already given himself to be known by them as the "Son of Man," the Renovator of Israel, the Founder of a holy Communion, a prophet mighty in word and deed, but not as the Messiah promised in the Old Covenant. He had not been able to assume this last character. He had no desire in fact to undertake the task assigned to the Messiah by the prophets. The Messiah of the Old Covenant was represented chiefly as the restorer of the outward and national greatness of Israel, as the founder of a golden age. As a ruler in the heart of the theocracy, surrounded with the glory of that, greater and more glorious than David, himself a David, he was to elevate the priesthood of Israel to a world-wide authority, and make the Old Testament theocracy the religion of the world and the city of Jerusalem the metropolis of the nations. Jesus had not recognized this task as his, and because he had not, he had hesitated to proclaim himself as the Messiah, and had given no hint to his most intimate disciples of the Messianic destination to which he was

of the Herodians, along with the Pharisees, appears to be a mistake. See Mark viii. 15.

appointed by his Heavenly Father. He had been called in fact to fulfil purposes the very opposite of those to which the expectations of Israel pointed. According to these expectations Israel was to reach the loftiest condition of earthly distinction and power, but Jesus was appointed to humble this people to the dust. According to these Messianic expectations the Pagan world was to bow to the sceptre of Israel, but he was to bid Israel bow down to Gentiles, and to obtain for Gentiles equal rights and equal rank with Jews. According to these same expectations the Messiah was to confirm the authority of the Jewish statutes for all time, but he was called to put an end to all legal religion and establish the Covenant of freedom in God in the place of the Covenant of subjection under God. The Messiah, as the Jews expected, was to effect a sudden and complete revolution in the order of nature and in the history of nations; Jesus was called, through the power of the Word and the Spirit, to change, slowly but all the more thoroughly, the natural and moral dispositions of mankind. The more plainly he saw, not only that he was wholly unable to satisfy the Messianic expectations of Israel, but that to the theocratic party he must seem to be the most determined opponent of all Messianic ideas, so much the more difficult was it for him to declare himself the Messiah.

4. And yet this he was bound to do. He was bound to cleanse the Messianic idea from the impure elements mixed up in it; he must release from the useless shell the germ of truth which was contained in it. He was, actually and truly, to realize this idea in the most exalted sense of the word. With a portion of Israel at least, this was the only way in which he could carry

out his thought, and accomplish the purpose of his calling. It was necessary that there should be an entire revolution in the popular and traditional representations of the Messiah. How he explained the Messianic promises of the Old Covenant we do not now know. The Evangelical records have preserved for us probably only the ideas of the Evangelists. The theocratic ordinances, we may suppose, were in his eyes only symbols that must come to an end when the time of their significance was fulfilled. In the same way, probably, he regarded the Messianic promises also as a series of symbolical representations of the future, needed by a people of little spiritual culture, and serving as a bridge to a purer understanding of God's revelation of himself through his Anointed and Sent. It was only from such a point of view, from which the Old Testament with its ordinances and promises was regarded as symbolical of the new order of things introduced by him, that Jesus could be satisfied with the application of the Messianic representations of the Old Covenant to himself and his work; and he could not but be aware that every appeal on his part to passages of the Old Testament was exposed to the most serious misunderstanding, not only among the hierarchical party, but also among his own disciples.

It was upon his journey through the villages in the neighborhood of Cæsarea Philippi that Jesus first disclosed to his disciples the fact that he was the Messiah. The reasons for the disclosure just at this time lay most probably in the following circumstances: —

As we have already remarked, the decisive hour was approaching. The hostility of the ruling party had increased to madness. Some of his followers had fallen away from him. In Capernaum, the earliest centre

of his labors, on the shores of the Lake of Gennesaret, his life was threatened. His adherents were disturbed by doubts and questionings concerning him. Uncertain, disquieted, they asked among themselves who Jesus was, and what it was that he proposed to do. The question had already been agitated between them and the people. It is observable that no suspicion of his being the Messiah had arisen among the people. He was compared with John the Baptist, with Elias, with other prophets of the old time; the Messiah no one surmised him to be, for he had done nothing whatever to cause him to appear as the Restorer of the political greatness of Israel. The disciples themselves required him to declare himself. Their minds needed to be set at rest.

As they were telling him the different opinions current concerning him, he suddenly asked: "And whom do you believe me to be?" Instantly, and as if inspired at the moment, Simon exclaimed in reply: "Thou art the Messiah!"[1] In acknowledging himself, in answer to Simon, as the Messiah, Jesus stepped at once from the embarrassing position in which he had been placed by the confused state of mind in his disciples and the conflict of opinion around him. A word was now spoken that kept his followers together, a banner was unfurled by which the wavering were rallied. A plain and defined position was gained against the hierarchy.

Jesus, it appears, had not looked for the decisive word to come from the lips of a disciple. His answer to Simon, which has proved an abundant source of

[1] Mark viii 29, where the simplest, primitive form of the answer of Simon is found. See Matt. xvi. 16, Luke ix. 20, and John vi. 69, which gives us the later amplification.

false representations, is preserved for us by only one Evangelist.[1] Jesus first declared that Simon's confession of faith in him had not been prompted by flesh and blood, meaning simply by this declaration that Simon had risen at the moment superior to the false Messianic ideas of the time, in recognizing him as "the Son of the living God," the spiritual deliverer of Israel. How little Simon was really aware of the import of his confession of faith the sequel plainly showed. Of more doubtful authority are the added words, in which Simon is honored with the surname of "Peter," and distinguished in a twofold way above the rest of the disciples. Jesus declares that upon him he will build his Church, and that to him the keys of the kingdom of heaven will be delivered, with the condition that what Peter bound on earth should be bound in heaven, and what he loosed on earth should be loosed in heaven. With what fidelity these words were reported in the Collection of Sayings, from which they were taken by the first Evangelist, we cannot now determine. In the original and more ancient form of the second Gospel, they did not appear; and the third Gospel, with its Gentile Christian bias, passed them by in the Collection of Sayings. From a subsequent passage[2] in the first Gospel it would seem that these words were not addressed to Peter exclusively, but to the disciples collectively, although the confession of Simon had nevertheless great weight with Jesus. There has been much misunderstanding of the honorable surname given to Simon as a man like a rock. It was neither Simon personally nor his confession in itself that Jesus could have regarded as the rock which was the foundation of his Church. But in *the Peter*

[1] Matt. xvi. 17–19.

[2] Matt. xviii. 18.

confessing Jesus just in this way, giving expression to a faith in his Messiahship which was the inspiration of the Heavenly Father, and not the offspring of hierarchical fanaticism, — it was the Simon thus rising to a truly ideal and spiritual conception of the kingdom of God, who is commended by his Master as a pillar in the future temple of his Church. Jesus could found his Communion only upon a new, spiritualized, morally purified faith in a Messiah; and he, Peter, in expressing such a faith, was hailed by Jesus as the man in whom he could confide; by this faith Peter showed that he would keep himself from the contaminating influence, the leaven, of the Pharisees and Herodians, and that he would be instrumental in the cause of Truth and Freedom.

Of greater significance is the word of Jesus that he would found his Church upon his disciples. He thus struck at the very root of all hierarchical tendencies. Having its foundation in its members collectively and its highest expression and most effective manifestation in their lives, the kingdom of God rests no longer in priestly prescription. It is true Jesus put into the hands of his disciples the keys which open the door to his Communion. What he meant by these keys, with which the heavenly kingdom is to be opened or shut to men, appears from his own example. His Word was the key. He never alluded to any other. It is by the word of regeneration and faith that entrance into the Communion of Jesus is granted or denied to men. Hence, in that declaration of his, what is given to his disciples is not personal power, but only official authority to close the entrance to his Communion to the impenitent and unbelieving, and open it to the penitent and the believing. Besides, Jesus granted

this authority only provisionally and under conditions. As long as he was standing at the head of his Church, he kept this great authority in his own hands. Not until after his departure, or in his absence, was it to be exercised in his stead by Peter and the Apostles as representatives of the Church. They were not only to announce the doctrine of the kingdom, they were also to receive such as were worthy and to close it against the unworthy. Strictly speaking, however, exclusion from this Communion was permitted only to the whole body of the Church, as a subsequent repetition of this remarkable utterance of Jesus in its right connection informs us.[1] No further authority is contained in these words of his. This authority was indispensable. It belongs to the nature of every association of men to determine, of itself or through its representatives, whether they who seek admission to it fulfil the requisite conditions, and whether they who are admitted discharge the duties of membership.(*c*)

5. But Jesus did not yet consider his disciples at large as sufficiently advanced to receive in its true sense the idea that he was the Messiah. Accordingly he forbade his immediate disciples making any communication of the fact to any one.[2] How entirely in conformity with his great purpose this prohibition was, is evident from the further disclosure which, after Simon had recognized his Messiahship, Jesus proceeded to make. The Messiah of the Old Testament was to reign. Crowned with honor and renown, he was to ascend the throne of David, re-established in a splendor far surpassing the times of the ancient Founder of the power of Israel. But the assured conviction

[1] Matt. xviii. 17.

[2] Mark viii. 30; Matt. xvi. 20; Luke ix. 21.

of Jesus had now for a long time been that it was his doom to suffer and to die for the work of his life. He saw with great satisfaction that Simon seemed no longer to share in the Messianic delusions of the hierarchical party, that he recognized the Messiah in him, the Founder of the inward, spiritual kingdom of God. But notwithstanding this recognition, Simon had not yet obtained any insight into the fate awaiting his Master. It came more naturally to him to yield himself to the delusive idea that the hostility of the hierarchy to Jesus would cease with time, that the way would be opened for a peaceful reform of Israel, and that Jesus would be rewarded at last for all his pains with earthly thanks and human honors. Even the more intelligent of the disciples were still beguiled by these illusive hopes, and the nearer the hour approached when a decisive position was to be taken, the more did Jesus hold it to be his duty to do what he might to dispel these visions. What he hitherto had not spoken of, partly because he himself had not attained to full certainty, and partly because his disciples were not prepared for it, that he now declared: that he was to be condemned by the highest court of the nation, and executed as a criminal. This his fate he referred to in no ambiguous terms. He pointed his disciples directly to it, suffering no doubt to linger in their minds as to the truth and strength of his own convictions on this point. That he and his cause were not to perish in suffering and death, — this likewise he declared beforehand with perfect confidence. With his sufferings he announced at the same time his resurrection ; with his apparent defeat, his speedy, certain, and glorious victory.

But what enigmas are wrapt up in a human heart!

The same Simon who had been the first to comprehend and declare the Messianic office of Jesus in the higher meaning of the word, was now the first to be surprised and shocked at the consequence necessarily involved in this higher idea. Thus the conscience and reason of men often fully accept what their secret inclinations resent with violence. There was awakened in the breast of Simon by the disclosures of Jesus an emotion doubly painful: a perfectly natural and generous sorrow for the cruel fate awaiting his beloved Master, mingled with a selfish anxiety for his own prospects and for his fellow disciples. And we may well suppose that the latter feeling was the stronger of the two. The position of Jesus now in relation to his disciples was critical. His declaration of his Messiahship was inseparable from the disclosure of his dark fate. His purpose was even to be a suffering Messiah, a Messiah the very opposite to the traditional Jewish idea. It was only by suffering and dying that he could consummate his destiny in full accordance with the divine will. The demand of Simon that he should avoid suffering was the renewal of the temptations that beset him so powerfully at the first after his meeting with the Baptist. He was no morose ascetic, knowing not how to appreciate the enjoyment of life and its pure pleasures. The vision of a career full of activity, rich in its results, crowned with honors, a career worthy in the sight of God and man, was by no means without a charm for him. It is in fact emphatically true of him, that, in the highest and fullest sense of the word, he had a profound joy in life. The prospect, opening before him, with steadily increasing clearness, of a shameful and violent death, could not but weigh, a heavy sorrow, upon his mind; and the desire

to avoid it was so purely human, it was so instinctive a dictate of a healthy nature, that it could not but be felt by a being really human. But it certainly was a temptation at the same time; and therefore Jesus called Simon a "Satan," i. e. a tempter, because he awakened in him desires that he should help him to crush. "Thou thinkest not of what is divine but of what is human."[1] How impressive this distinction, and what moral elevation it shows! Human was it in this case to avoid suffering, divine was it to bear it for God's sake. Why it was absolutely necessary the disciples, the Church, had yet to learn.

NOTES.

[*a*. p. 13. Notwithstanding our author's objections I see no reason to doubt that the declaration of Jesus to his disciples, "I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel," was made by him as reported, especially since his work was in fact confined to his own countrymen. Admitting the suggestion as very probable that Jesus made this journey into Phœnicia from a desire to know something of the moral condition of the Gentile world, may we not suppose that, as the result of his observations, he felt himself bound to devote himself to the work of enlightening his own countrymen? He may justly have concluded from what he had seen and heard that such was the part of true wisdom.

b. p. 17. With great respect for the opinions of our learned author, I cannot but think that his remarks upon "the demand for a sign," are based upon a misapprehension of the nature of this demand. A careful examination of the passages in the Gospels in which we are told that his enemies required of Jesus a sign, leads us to the conclusion that it was not a mere miracle that was desired, but a miracle which should accord with the traditional idea of the Messiah and prove Jesus to be such a Messiah as the nation was looking for. The

[1] Mark viii. 33; Matt. xvi. 23.

demand was always made just after he had done some wonderful thing, and so far from being made to entrap and confound him, it strikes me as an implied confession on the part of the Pharisees of his extraordinary character. It is, I repeat, as if they said to him: "You certainly are a wonderful person and you do very wonderful things. Now only give us a sign that will show you to be the Messiah we are looking for and we will acknowledge you." And it appears to me that so Jesus himself understood them. He looked upon it as a transient evidence of relenting on their part from their opposition or unbelief. The most striking occasion upon which a sign was asked of him is the one upon which I have already remarked. (See note to ch. ix.) In that instance Jesus illustrated the moral condition of the Pharisees by the case of a man subject to fits of insanity, or, according to the opinions of the day, possessed by an evil spirit that when it left the man left him only to return with sevenfold violence. Is there not an intimation in this comparison that the Pharisees, in asking for a sign, seemed for the moment to be recovering their moral sanity?

And here the profound interest of the great subject of these pages must be my apology for repeating what I have said in a former work (see "The Veil partly lifted, &c.," pp. 169–178), where in reference to the naturalness of the teachings of Jesus the following remarks occur: "I ask the reader's attention to the passage in the history which is found in two of the Gospels (Matt. xvi. 1–8; Luke xii. 54–57), and in which Jesus is reported to have said, 'Ye can discern the face of the sky and of the earth but how is it that ye do not discern this time?' Before putting this question he remarked, 'When ye see a cloud rise out of the west straightway ye say, There cometh a shower, and so it is. And when ye see the south wind blow ye say, There will be heat, and it cometh to pass.' And again he is recorded to have expressed the same thought with different instances. 'When it is evening ye say, It will be fair weather, for the sky is red. And in the morning, It will be foul weather, for the sky is red and lowering.' And then it is added, in one Gospel, 'O ye hypocrites!' (or O ye pretenders!) 'ye can discern the face of the sky, but can ye not the signs of the times?' And in the other the last clause is, 'But how is it that ye do not discern this time?' Mark the emphasis of the interrogative form of expression here employed, implying as it does that then it was a great deal easier to read the signs of the time, the significance of pass-

ing events, than it was to tell from the appearance of the sky or from the direction of the wind what the weather was going to be.

"Consider the occasion upon which Jesus is said to have spoken thus. Certain leading persons came to him, and asked him to give them a sign from heaven. Supposing this request to have been made in good faith, we should naturally infer that they who made it were perplexed to know what to think and do, groping in the dark, and wanting to be directed aright. They wanted an intimation from heaven to show them their way. But their perplexity was all of their own making. Had they really desired to be directed aright, nothing could have been plainer to them than the true way. Jesus with his clear insight saw at a glance that they were not true men. He treated them with no respect. He called them hypocrites to their faces. For it was not possible, at a great hour like that, for any human being, if he were honest, with sense enough to understand the most common signs of the weather, not to see and understand what was then going on. It was impossible, it would have been an insult to human nature to suppose that these persons could be sincere in asking for heavenly guidance when there were such pointed signs, such signs of the will of heaven as men had never before been favored with, — signs far less ambiguous than the familiar indications of the changing weather that appear in the sky; and any one who could read these — and who could not? — might far more easily read those. If a man could not discern the heavenly significance of the events which illustrated that hour, there could be only one reason for it, and that reason must have been in his own perverted will. Well is Jesus recorded to have 'sighed deeply in the spirit' over such incorrigible blindness. (Mark viii. 12.)

"Only think what a time it was, and what a sign from heaven was the appearance of Jesus himself, and the wide and deep sensation he was producing! Here was a young man suddenly emerging from obscurity, with nothing imposing in his surroundings, with nothing special in his person to recommend him, startling the whole country with his extraordinary personal power, gathering immense crowds around him from all quarters by the astonishing things he was doing and by the unprecedented air of authority with which he was publishing truths of the deepest interest. The whole land was kindled into a flame of wonder

and awe. The very dregs of the people, the outcasts, from the pollution of whose touch the pious shrunk with scorn, pressed around him, watching every movement of his, eager to catch every word that fell from his lips, and following him about until they were ready to drop from hunger and fatigue. Such an enthusiasm was he creating, such confidence did he inspire, that through some mysterious power that was native to him, individuals were instantaneously relieved from what were accounted incurable diseases by a brief word from him, by the bare touch of his hand or only of his clothes. The blind saw again at his bidding and the lame walked; the deranged mind was restored to soundness, and in two or three instances, the recently dead came back to life.

"Was not the demonstration of so extraordinary a presence a flaming sign from heaven, far beyond in significance any portent that might have appeared in the sky? What could any mortal man in those days want more to seize his attention, to set him thinking with strange earnestness, to break off from him the imprisoning crust of custom, and cause his whole being to dilate with new and life-giving emotion? It had this effect — the exciting spectacle — upon numbers, and upon a class who might be supposed to be the last to be able to read the signs of the time. The ignorant and the low, odious tax-gatherers and harlots, in whose company no respectable person would be seen, forsook their foul haunts, forgot their evil practices, and went after this strange man to see what he would do, to hear what he had to say. Uncared for and hardened by loss of character, they nevertheless, or rather on this very account, because they were conscious of their miserable condition, recognized the manifest sign of the time. To them, in the new and deep interest that he stirred, Jesus was in truth a messenger straight from heaven. It was as if the finger of God were pointing and beckoning them to a fountain of healing set flowing in full, rich streams. As readily as when a cloud rose in the west they knew that rain was coming, or as when the wind blew from the south that it would be warm, so the appearance of Jesus betokened to the very instincts of these poor creatures, wandering as in an arid waste, the coming shower of Divine Mercy. It was the breath of the Eternal Spirit, spring-like in their wintry desolation, and prognosticating the benign warmth of a better life.

"And yet amidst the full splendor of this most manifest sign

from heaven, when the whole population was heaving and thrilling at its presence, there came these Pharisees and learned men, persons of religious repute, corresponding to the clergy of the present day, and wanted Jesus to give them a sign from God! Where were their hearts? Had they eyes? Were they bereft of their senses, destitute of common discernment? Were they stocks and stones? Who can wonder that he pronounced them on the spot hypocrites, pretending to want what, as they were not stone-blind and deaf, was blazing before their eyes and sounding incessantly in their ears! They knew, did they? from the appearance of the sky when it was going to rain or to be clear; but when the blind were restored to sight and the lame walked, and the poor were flocking in great crowds to listen to the words of instruction, and all men's minds were burning with new thoughts, and the power and presence of Heaven were thus strikingly demonstrated, they were utterly in the dark and must needs come to Jesus and ask him for a sign to show them what they were to think and do. There could be no question of their duplicity. So far from desiring what they asked, a sign *from heaven*, the sign they wanted could only come from an opposite quarter. They were hungry for national aggrandizement, for popularity and power, for vengeance upon their Roman conquerors. The only sign they wanted was a sign which Heaven had not to give, a new assurance that they were Heaven's especial favorites. So besotted were they, they could tell readily when it would rain, but they could not understand things of infinitely plainer significance of heavenly wisdom and power than any appearances in the sky were of the weather."

c. p. 25. I cannot regard as altogether satisfactory the account given here of the passage in the history of Jesus, to the elucidation of which section 4 of the foregoing chapter is devoted.

It is related that at this period Jesus desired to ascertain from his disciples what the people at large thought of him, whom they supposed him to be. In answer to his inquiries his disciples told him that some supposed him to be John the Baptist, and some Elias, and others again thought he was one of the old prophets risen from the dead. As they made no mention of the existence of any opinion of his Messiahship, Dr. Schenkel thinks that to no one outside the circle of the disciples had any such idea

occurred. But although the disciples make no report of any popular opinion of this kind, yet it is not at all likely that no suspicion of Jesus being the Messiah had arisen among the people. It appears that the immediate disciples had caught this idea, although they gave no expression to it, and did not make it known to their Master that such was their thought until he questioned them. As it was with the disciples so was it in a less degree with the people at large. There was a secret hope more or less prevalent that this wonderful man from Nazareth would prove to be the promised Deliverer of the nation. Its existence is incidentally betrayed. When he healed the man who was blind and dumb, it was said among the people, "Is not this the Son of David," i. e. the Messiah? (Matt. xii. 23.) Again possessed persons, losing all self-control, cried out and addressed him as the promised Son of God. The people at large were more cautious.

Again Dr. Schenkel appears to think that Simon, in declaring for himself and his fellow-disciples that they believed Jesus to be the Christ, shows that he had caught an idea of the true, spiritual Messiahship of Jesus. Undoubtedly it manifested a childlike openness and simplicity of mind in Peter and the rest to have come to recognize the magnificent Messiah in a person of so humble an exterior as Jesus. It evinced their sensibility to the moral charm of his truth and goodness. That Jesus himself so regarded the confession of Peter is evident from the fervor in which he breaks forth in a blessing upon the Apostle, — mark the individualizing emphasis with which he addressed him: "Blessed art thou, *Simon son of Jonas!*" But although Peter avowed his faith that Jesus was the Christ, it by no means follows that any radical change had taken place in his idea of the Messiah, or that he had risen "to a truly ideal and spiritual conception of the kingdom of God." In recognizing Jesus as the Messiah, Peter, as his Master declared, had taken no counsel of "flesh and blood." It was not in consequence, but in spite of his Jewish views, his flesh and blood hopes, that he had been led to this faith. It was the result of his appreciation of the truth and goodness of Jesus, the offspring of that spirit which is the inspiration of God in the soul of man. Still that he retained his old Messianic visions, and that those visions were rendered even more vivid and exciting by the idea that Jesus was the promised deliverer and king, is manifest from the boldness with which he

instantly contradicted Jesus when the latter proceeded to declare that he, Messiah though he was, would be put to death. The more confident Peter was that Jesus was the Messiah the more shocked was he at the idea that so illustrious a personage was to suffer violence and shame. The truth is that although the personal disciples were sufficiently honest and simple-hearted to be touched deeply by the moral and spiritual qualities of Jesus, they were nevertheless under the influence of very selfish and worldly motives; they were thirsting for the riches and honors which they expected to obtain through him.

The declaration made by Jesus to Simon upon giving him the name of Peter (Rock): "Upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven," savors to my mind very much of a gloss by a later hand. It is found in the first Gospel, not in the second, which Dr. Schenkel considers the most primitive of all the four Gospels; and the absence of this passage in the second Gospel is the more remarkable as the tradition is that this Gospel was derived immediately from Peter. It is one of the only two passages in the Gospels (see for the other Matt. xviii. 15–18) that give color to the idea that Jesus aimed to organize an institution, the so called Church. Our author's explanation of this passage strikes me as labored and unsatisfactory, partaking too much of the ideas of a time subsequent to that of Jesus and not in accordance with the general scope of the life and teachings of Jesus. — TRANS.]

CHAPTER XIII.

THE TRANSFIGURATION OF THE PERSON OF JESUS.

1. To the Jews a suffering Messiah was a contradiction in terms. The Old Testament knows nothing of such an idea, neither is it found in the later Rabbinical or Talmudical writings. Before Jesus could represent himself to his disciples as the suffering Messiah, the last tie that bound him to the popular traditional mode of thinking among his countrymen must have been broken forever in his mind. There was nothing now in common between the hopes of his contemporaries and his personal convictions. The future opened before him in an entirely new light. The fulfilment of the Old Covenant was the non-fulfilment of all the theocratic expectations. The idea that the Messiah was to rise to the height of earthly power was to be realized by his descent into the depths of mortal weakness and shame.

The conviction that suffering was the supreme destiny and true consecration of his office as a Redeemer had gradually grown into full clearness in the inmost being of Jesus; and it was only through this conviction that he rose to the dimensions of his great work and accomplished it in himself. From this moment on he gave utterance to his profoundest thoughts, to truths of the grandest import, for all centuries the most momentous, to sentiments than which none more elevated ever flowed from human lips. An unearthly splendor now beamed from him; he was no longer under constraint; he revealed himself fully as he was. The

light of his inner life, hitherto more or less under a veil, shone with unclouded power into the darkness of human sin and sorrow.

Having announced his suffering destiny to the Apostles; having repelled the very first motions of the tempting instinct of self-preservation, and in so doing put Simon to shame; it was necessary that he should dispel in the larger circle of his adherents every delusion in regard to his purpose, especially as he aimed to define with increasing exactness the nature of the Communion which he was gathering. He therefore called around him a number of those friendly to him, who until now had kept at a distance, among whom doubtless there were not a few still very much in the dark as to his aims,[1] and to these persons he announced the conditions upon which alone it was thenceforth possible to adhere to his cause, — "to follow him."

As the first indispensable condition of discipleship he demanded self-sacrifice, self-renunciation. The essential vice of the hierarchical party was egoism. Their hearts were set on property, length of days, worldly enjoyment. For every good deed there must be a reward, and every virtue God was expected to recompense richly. This root of all evil was to be thoroughly extirpated. Good is to be done, not with an eye to a reward, but for its own sake alone. The love of God and our neighbor is its own reward. Every sacrifice for truth, right, freedom, is a spring of pure and abiding joy. When the supreme good, the life eternal, is communicated to the members of the kingdom of God, other goods lose all worth in comparison. For this reason Jesus required without qualification that his disciples should rise superior to the

[1] Mark viii. 34; Matt. xvi. 24; Luke ix. 23.

instinct of self-preservation, renounce the mortal life for the immortal, consider the collected goods of earth as naught compared with a heavenly prize; only thus would they be in a condition to meet with a calm courage the grave events that were approaching. He plainly foresees, however, that his disciples will prove unequal to the coming trials, that among the well-disposed now gathered around him there will not be wanting instances of defection. He therefore declares his condemnation of such false disciples. Whosoever denies him and his cause in the hour of need, will be denied by him in the day of his glory.

Thus, not only his future sufferings but his future glory Jesus foresaw and foretold. According to the evangelical tradition he repeatedly announced to his disciples his resurrection and reappearance in triumphant splendor.[1] It is not however probable that he foretold his resurrection in such explicit terms. According to this same tradition the Apostles were evidently astonished at his resurrection. The first rumor of it they received with utter incredulity, and they were with difficulty convinced that it had the authority of the ancient Scripture.(*a*) That Jesus foretold his reappearance in glory is altogether probable, only the deep moral, spiritual sense of the prediction must not be confounded with the form in which the prediction was given. It is neither proved nor is it possible that he predicted a personal return in the body, in the visible brightness of a heavenly glory and attended by angelic hosts, for the purpose of establishing an earthly kingdom. He, whose kingdom was a kingdom of truth, of righteousness, of love, a kingdom

[1] Mark viii. 31; Matt. xvi. 21; Luke ix. 22; Mark viii. 38; Matt. xvi. 27; Luke ix. 26.

of the Spirit, could not possibly represent external splendor, material power, as its crowning object. He usually put forth his deepest thoughts in those imaginative forms that were fitted to the apprehension of his hearers. They were, naturally enough, unable to rise to the purely spiritual conception of the reappearance of their Master. Even had Jesus described his return as wholly spiritual in its nature, his disciples would nevertheless have pictured it to themselves, arrayed in visible pomp, invested with the external ensigns of power.

2. So much may be said with confidence: In the same solemn moment in which Jesus for the first time explicitly foretold his approaching ignominious end, he announced also for the first time that a complete success would follow immediately upon the apparent destruction of his life and his cause. It was necessary that his disciples should fully understand the fearful case, and not deceive themselves for an instant in regard to the daily increasing danger; but they were also to cherish an assured hope of the ultimate victory that would crown the cause to which they had given strength and heart, property and life.

Jesus was thoroughly penetrated with the conviction that that generation would witness the triumph of his Gospel. In the second and third Gospels the declaration which he made to this effect is preserved in its original form.[1] He affirmed in the plainest manner that many of those who were standing around him would see the kingdom of God coming with power. The later tradition was not contented with this simple statement. In the first Gospel it is so far changed as to represent him as having said that some of those

[1] Mark ix. 1; Luke ix. 27.

present would not die before they saw the "Son of Man" come in his kingdom.[1] Although Jesus foretold his return in an impersonal sense, it corresponded better with later ideas to represent it as a personal reappearance. Thus what he meant in a moral and spiritual sense came to have an outward and material significance.

In consequence of these disclosures Jesus rose to a state of mind unusually elevated. The secret of his life was now declared, the whole sum and substance of his mission revealed. His future was unveiled. The apparent defeat and the sure triumph of his cause stood before his eyes as well as those of his disciples as unchangeable facts. For his country, and indeed for all nations, he had consecrated himself a spotless sacrifice to death. It was on Gentile soil that he stood when he foretold Suffering and Victory. Already then in spirit and with his heart he embraced all mankind. He had already consecrated himself to death by all that he had thought and said and done. But in thus opening his inmost soul to his disciples, in thus confiding to them his most secret thoughts, and in making such momentous communications in regard to his future and the development of his kingdom to a still larger circle of his followers, what profound emotions must have been his, possessed as he was of such keen sensibilities! He must have stood in need for a time of undisturbed repose, in order to collect and strengthen himself. With Simon, James and John, therefore, the most intimate of his immediate disciples, he withdrew into the still mountain-world, seeking to be alone with them there. How long he remained in this retirement we do not know. A remarkable incident

[1] Matt. xvi. 28.

that occurred then and there is related in the records. Upon the top of the mountain which Jesus ascended with his disciples, it is stated that a most wonderful change suddenly came over him. His features and even his clothes shone with light, his person seemed like an apparition from a higher world. Wonder followed upon wonder. The gates of the fore-world flew open; holy men of the Old Testament passed; Moses and Elias, the pillars of the Old Covenant, appeared and talked with Jesus of the fearful fate awaiting him in Jerusalem. A cloud came down from heaven; and the same Divine voice, which at his baptism had proclaimed Jesus the beloved Son of God, was again heard attesting his authority.[1]

That this incident could not have occurred as thus reported, is intimated even by certain particulars of the evangelical narrative itself. According to the third Gospel, the three disciples present were sound asleep,[2] while the second represents them as so frightened that Simon Peter, for example, knew not what he said.[3] The first Gospel reports that they were so bereft of all presence of mind that Jesus had to take hold of them to recall them to themselves. Even, therefore, while the event narrated was taking place, the immediate witnesses of it were evidently without any power of calm observation. They could not possibly have formed a correct idea of the occurrence. It accordingly easily took, in the later tradition, a legendary form. There is nevertheless an historical fact at the basis of this evangelical narration. After the excitement and exhaustion of his recent revelations Jesus did really resort with his three intimate friends to the

[1] Mark ix. 2; Matt. xvii. 1; Luke ix. 28. [2] Luke ix. 32.
[3] Mark ix. 6.

mountain retreat, and there hold communion with Moses and Elias. But we must not content ourselves with the mere hull of the narrative, we must penetrate to the central life of it. How much had he yet to say to those friends of his, which they had hitherto been unable to bear, concerning the position in which he stood to those hero-forms of the Old Covenant! Moses and Elias they had not yet come rightly to estimate. They did not yet understand the subordinate rank in sacred history of those personages. Now for the first time, from the lofty height of that Messianic consciousness which was spiritualized and made complete in him as the person who sought to save the nation, not with the sword and sceptre, but by suffering and dying, Jesus could tell his disciples what was the true relation which he bore to Moses and Elias. He was now able to show them the difference between himself and those upholders of the Old Testament theocracy. Therefore he set before his three intimate friends (the other disciples were not yet able to bear it,) Moses and Elias as they really were in the light of his Messianic destiny. Both these prophets, great as they were, mighty as were their labors, one as the founder, the other as the guardian of the Law, stood nevertheless infinitely below him, — were in fact only his precursors and signs. Thenceforth their authority was subordinate to his. In him the completion of their imperfect work was to be looked for. The later tradition has obliterated in this narrative traits full of significance. Luke[1] represents Moses and Elias as sharing in the splendor of the transfiguration, while, according to the two other Evangelists, it was Jesus alone who was transfigured. The traces of a

[1] Luke ix. 31.

later hand amplifying the wonder are here visible. The fading glory of those Old Testament personages was now to vanish before the new light rising in Jesus. They were both men of the letter. In their bosoms there throbbed no inexhaustible love, no hearts all a-glow with Divine mercy. They were men of iron will, of stern purpose. Their hands were stained with blood, and it was with force and violence that they had sought to prepare the way for the kingdom of God. But Jesus was to pour out his own blood in the service of his country and mankind. Such was the glory that made him saintly. Herein was the light of his transfiguration.

The weariness and exhaustion of the three disciples, — a condition in which we find them again in one of the most critical hours in the life of Jesus, — and their desire to tarry longer on the spot, listening to converse so inspiring, and opening to them such new views, are particulars in the story of the Transfiguration altogether credible. Without doubt the disciples heard the voice from the cloud, not indeed with the outward ear. It was audible only to their inner sense, — it was the voice of that conviction, steadily growing stronger in their hearts, that a new and better revelation was given in Jesus to the people of Israel, that in his countenance beamed the countenance of God himself, that in him the promises of the Old Covenant found their glorious fulfilment, and that in a far higher sense than the people of Israel, or even their kings, high-priests, and prophets thought, Jesus was the first-begotten Son of God.[1] Surrounded by the light of a new revelation, he appeared to the three in a new form. The glory of a higher world was shed over his

[1] Exod. iv. 22; Deut. xxxii. 6; Ps. lxxxii. 6; Hosea ii. 1.

person. He stood there before their eyes, filled with the Spirit. Never before had they discerned so plainly his hidden greatness. Never before had his serene elevation, his incomparable superiority even to the greatest men of the Old Covenant, been made so manifest to their spiritual vision. The astonishment, the fear, the awe, the prostration of the disciples, as described by the Evangelists, are traits entirely historical. Hitherto they had regarded their Master mainly on the natural, human side. Now there was revealed to them a divine, supernatural greatness and dignity. A sacred awe thrilled their souls. Can we wonder that these excitable men under such circumstances rose to a state of ecstasy, and imagined they saw celestial apparitions and heard voices from another world? Is it not easy to be understood how the later tradition exaggerated incidents in themselves unusual, and made them still more wonderful? (*b*)

3. That the incident on the mountain was in reality what we have represented it, finds confirmation in the conversation that passed between Jesus and his disciples upon leaving the place. They had come to a right understanding of Moses and of his relation to Jesus. But as to the significance of Elias in this same relation they were still in doubt. According to the prevalent notion of the time, Elias was to appear and announce the advent of the Messiah. But Elias had not yet appeared. And yet Jesus had declared himself to his disciples as the Messiah. Here was a point that still disturbed them. Here was an enigma that Jesus was to solve. There would have been no difficulty had Elias appeared to the disciples on the Mount of Transfiguration in a visible form. It was because Elias had not really appeared to them that

doubt and hesitation arose in their minds. The way also that Jesus took to relieve the difficulty shows clearly that Elias had not appeared to them.[1] He rejects as unfounded the expectations, prevalent among the Jewish theologues, of the return of Elias before the coming of the Messianic times. According to the prevalent opinion Elias was to appear before the Messiah, "to restore all things," so that in this case the Messiah could enter into his kingdom only after it had been completely established. Such expectations accorded with the splendid idea of the Messiah cherished by the Pharisees, but not with the idea of a suffering and dying Deliverer. Hence Jesus declared without qualification that the prophet Elias would *not* prepare the way for him. The promise of the reappearance of Elias[2] had been fulfilled — such was the conviction of Jesus — in the appearance of the Baptist. The forerunner of the suffering Messiah could not be one who "restored all things"; he must be one whose own fate was a type of the Messiah's, one upon whom men wreaked their malice, a man like John the Baptist.[3] Thus freely and independently of the letter did Jesus interpret the Old Testament prophecy. Thus decisively did he account suffering the necessary condition for the work of the divine kingdom.[4]

[1] What Jesus said is preserved in Mark in its original form (Mark ix. 12). Compare Matt. xvii. 11.

[2] Malachi iv. 5.

[3] Mark ix. 13; Matt. xvii. 12.

[4] See Appendix, III. 17, p. 44.

NOTES.

[*a*. p. 37. That, after their Master was executed, the disciples had no expectation of his rising from the dead, and received the report of his resurrection with incredulity, is no proof that Jesus did not utter the predictions of that event ascribed to him in the Gospels. We are expressly told that when Jesus predicted his death and his rising from the dead, the disciples "understood none of these things, and this saying was hid from them, neither knew they the things that were spoken." (Luke xviii. 34.) And there is a good reason at hand why they did not understand him, explicit as his language was. Those predictions of his death and resurrection were uttered by Jesus upon occasions when the minds of his disciples were full of the idea that he was the Messiah. Consequently nothing could be more entirely abhorrent to their minds than the thought of his death, and especially of his suffering a violent and ignominious death. The Messiah, in their apprehensions, was to live and reign a thousand years, and with him was identified all that is great and magnificent. They could not conceive it to be possible that he whom they believed to be the Messiah should be put to death. And when Jesus declared that such was to be his fate, he so often spoke in parables and said so many things that they could not comprehend, that it was a great deal easier to conclude that he had some meaning which they could not understand than to think that he really meant what his language appeared to express. As the disciples of Jesus were thus unable to take in the idea of his death, they gave no heed to the consequent idea of his rising from the dead; and therefore we find that, when his death had actually taken place, they were overwhelmed by the fearful reality. They "mourned and wept." All the past under the first crushing weight of that blow was to them no better than a delusion and a dream. Their fondest hopes, the hopes with which he had inspired them, of wealth and honor, were all utterly blasted. The one overpowering fact that he was dead filled their minds to the exclusion of every other thought. Why should they recall anything in particular that he had said, when all the bright visions which his whole life had seemed to warrant them in cherishing, had vanished in utter darkness?

b. p. 43. So far as we are able to understand Dr. Schenkel's

idea of the Transfiguration, it is that the narrative of this event is a legend that grew out of the communications made by Jesus to his three disciples on the mountain, — communications concerning the position in which Moses and Elias stood to him as the Messiah, and tending to glorify him in their eyes. The purely spiritual glory which thus invested Jesus on this occasion, the later tradition represented as an outward and visible splendor. Such appears to be our author's view of this passage of the history. The chief defect of this view is that it supposes a rather wholesale fabrication of particulars. The three accounts of the so-called Transfiguration are strikingly circumstantial. A legendary hypothesis ought to be able to show what specially gave occasion to the several circumstances of which the story is composed. This is what Strauss always attempts. Our idea of this passage is that without any violence done to the letter of these narratives the Transfiguration may easily be resolved into a dream, not a supernatural vision, but a dream, a very natural dream of Peter's. As I have endeavored so to explain it at considerable length in former publications, I will only indicate here as briefly as possible the considerations which lead me to take this view of it. 1. According to the third Gospel, Peter and they that were with him were sound asleep when the spectacle began. The phrase in the original is very strong: *βεβαρημένοι ὕπνῳ*. The statements of persons in this condition are to be taken with caution. 2. It is implied that the Transfiguration commenced before the disciples awoke. 3. The presumption is that the occurrence took place in the night. 4. Upon a careful examination of the different accounts, the chief particulars related took place at one and the same moment. "*As Moses and Elias were departing*" Peter spoke. "*And while Peter was speaking*" a cloud came up and a voice came from the cloud. "And when *the disciples heard it*," they fell on their faces and were sore afraid. Now we have only to suppose, and it is no irrational supposition, that the cloud that came up and that probably hung low over the mountain height, was attended by a flash of lightning and thunder, and it is natural to conclude that we have here one of those instances of which we have almost all had experience and in which dreams of quite a circumstantial character are produced by the very noises that awaken the dreamers. That certain of those ancient prophets to whom reference had been made in conversation between Jesus and his disciples a little while before, and who were

expected to re-appear when the Messiah came; that "his decease at Jerusalem," of which Jesus had spoken on the same occasion and which had made so painful an impression on the mind of Peter; and finally, that Peter's idea of Jesus as the glorious Messiah, rendered more vivid by the recent admission of Jesus himself that he was that personage, should have excited the active imagination of Peter and shaped his dream, is certainly a perfectly natural conjecture. And that Peter should impose his account of what had happened upon James and John, and that they, startled suddenly from deep slumber, hearing Peter talking in an excited tone while they themselves were in a state of great fright, should take his account without demur, and consider themselves as having witnessed what they had been dimly aware of only in part, is entirely characteristic of all concerned and in keeping with the circumstances.

In his remarks on the Transfiguration, and thus far at least throughout, Dr. Schenkel does not appear to me clearly to recognize the striking and natural manner in which Jesus was gradually spiritualizing the peculiar Jewish ideas of his disciples. It was not by direct verbal instruction, as Dr. Schenkel seems to represent. The disciples were not consciously led by anything said by their Master to form any more spiritual conceptions of Jesus as the Messiah. Much that he said they did not understand, or they understood it in a very narrow sense. The more their faith grew in his Messiahship the more confident were their expectations, the more lively their visions of the riches and honors that awaited them. It was on this account, as he told them, that it was necessary for their sakes that he should leave them. What then was the spiritual help that they received from him? How was it that he enlightened and elevated them? Elevated they certainly were by their intercourse with him, for those humble fishermen of Galilee came to be world-renowned Apostles. The truth is, it was far more by what he was than by what he said that he gained their hearts and moulded them to his purpose. It was not so much the ideas that they gathered from his words as the spirit which they unconsciously caught from his life, from his personal character, that inspired them. Their Jewish prejudices were never all formally renounced. It was not until years after the death of his Master, that Peter made the full discovery that it was lawful for him to eat with persons of another nation. (Acts x.) The expectation of the return of Jesus in visible glory, the

primitive disciples never relinquished to the day of their death. But the fact was, that although the trammels of their Jewish culture clung to them to the last, it was just as the old bark clings to the tree which is inwardly expanding with a new life. They were early touched by the charm of their Master's character, signified as it was by every quality that could awaken reverence, trust, love. The increasing personal affection with which he inspired them by the sanctity of his life, by his looks beaming with truth, by his tones thrilling them with a sense of his tenderness and sincerity, — this it was which gradually so enlarged and exalted them, and which so became their animating principle, that their old traditional ideas, though never, as I have said, deliberately renounced, gradually lost power to influence them. They never ceased to cherish the dream of a splendid earthly kingdom, but it grew more and more dreamy, the pinnacles and spires of that glorious kingdom slowly receded in the distance and grew dimmer and dimmer as they entered more fully into the spirit of their Master and their love and reverence for him deepened. And their affection for him, — what was it but another name for the love of all that is true and good? The highest and best was steadily and unconsciously obtaining possession of their hearts to the exclusion of their old ways of thought and feeling.

It is most interesting to observe the influence which Jesus thus had upon his personal disciples. In the whole history there is nothing more thoroughly true to nature, for it was for the most part the unconscious, involuntary influence of his personal life. And just as unconsciously and undesignedly is its existence apparent in the Gospels. Into what profound reverence was the attachment of the disciples to Jesus deepening, what faith must they have come to repose in him, in what awe of him must they have stood, when towards the last he told them that one of them was about to prove false to him, and that touching cry arose among them, "Lord, is it I?" Conscious as they were of no evil design, yet it was impossible, they felt, that he should utter a false accusation. He knew them best. They could distrust themselves, but not him.

Primitive Christianity is looked upon too much in the light of a great plan, — plan of salvation, as it is called; and Dr. Schenkel's representation of Jesus gives us the impression that Jesus had at heart a scheme, simple, spiritual, free indeed, but nevertheless a scheme, into a speculative understanding of which he

aimed to initiate his disciples. Whereas it appears to me that the Life of Jesus, with its immediate effects and consequences, was a natural growth, which is only saying in other words that it was not the work of man, but the work of God. And the records of that Life, the four Gospels, will be found, I am persuaded, to have the same natural origin and character. — TRANS.]

CHAPTER XIV.

HIGHER TEACHING.

1. THE disciples had passed through their first probation. They had been led by their Master to the spiritual height of the Messianic vision, and initiated into the depth of the evangelical mystery of the kingdom of God. The work to be done by Jesus in Galilee was nearly finished. He had gathered around him a Church, which was set free from the yoke of the letter and from spiritual subjection to the hierarchy, and upon the foundation of truth, freedom, righteousness, and love for God and man, had obtained a firm support. He had already scattered the seeds of his ideas in the neighboring regions of heathendom. He had boldly confronted the ruling party, the Jewish theologues and hierarchs, and had shown his opposition to them more and more pointedly. The irreconcilability of a new conviction with the popular traditions, of a spiritual kingdom of Faith with the theocratic kingdom of Law, was no longer in question. A great final struggle, a life and death conflict, between two modes of thought of world-wide influence, had become inevitable. But it was not in Galilee that the approaching decision could take place, but the central

point of the theocracy, the city of Jerusalem, must be its theatre. There in the seat of Judaism, stiff and stark in its traditionary statutes, under the eyes of the supreme ecclesiastical authorities, in sight of the temple and its sacrificial ceremonial, before the representatives of the reigning theology of the schools, Jesus must vindicate his principles, found his Church, contend with his foes, seal the great work with his blood.

After he had once publicly declared himself the Messiah, it lay in the nature of the case that the ultimate decision could not much longer wait. The hierarchy was bound either to acknowledge or to crush him. But it was not for him to precipitate the hour. As it was an urgent necessity that the insight and convictions of his disciples should be clear and strong as to his peculiar destiny, so would it be necessary, not only that they should stand by him faithfully in the last conflict, but that, when he fell, they should maintain his cause and extend and advance it under the greatest difficulties and dangers. On this account he had already accustomed them, upon their first missionary journey, to decide and act in some degree for themselves. Before transferring his labors to Judea, he deemed a second more extended missionary excursion indispensable to their better preparation. With the change of his sphere, a new field appeared to offer itself. Among the Samaritans, who were generally much under the influence of heathenism, the Gospel had not yet been published. The journey to Judea led by the nearest way through Samaria. How could the disciples better prepare themselves for the final struggle, than by a preliminary enterprise among a population still so far removed from the Gospel as the Samaritans were? If it seem strange that Luke alone

mentions this second missionary journey,[1] it is to be observed, on the other hand, that there is an evident *hiatus*[2] at this point in both the other Gospels, as the last journey of Jesus from Galilee to Judea is told by them very briefly. Luke comes in here with his account of this journey, completing the narrative.

Before his journey to Judea, Jesus had considerably increased the number of his disciples. That they amounted to the precise number of seventy, as Luke states, is not probable. Jesus appears to have kept the smaller circle of his disciples near him, while the others, like the Apostles upon the first missionary journey, were training themselves for self-dependent action. He devoted his attention in an especial manner to the Apostles. Everything depended upon their thorough culture, moral and religious, and upon their being steeled against the temptations to weakness and disloyalty. Even their progress was very slow. They advanced in their own way only with faltering steps. They made attempts at healing, and were not always successful. They defended the new doctrine against the Pharisaical theology,[3] and did not always gain the advantage. Their inaptness, ignorance, and uncertainty were the first of the sufferings of Jesus upon his journey to Jerusalem.

Why was it that even the most intelligent of the Apostles were so slow to comprehend their calling? The truth is, it was extremely difficult for them to conceive of suffering and death as the appointed destiny of their Master. They had gradually learned to understand and revere him as a prophet, as a man mighty

[1] Luke x. 1. [2] Mark x. 1; Matt. xix. 1.
[3] Mark ix. 14.

3291/5
232.9
S324c
v.2
THE CINCINNATI BIBLE SEMINARY
LIBRARY

in word and deed, as the founder of a pious Communion gathered from among the neglected and oppressed people. When he stood before them on the mountain transfigured, surrounded by the splendor of a divine majesty, they were filled with a holy fear, a sacred rapture. They trusted then that they would be able to suffer and die with him. But afterwards, as the decisive hour drew nearer, they lacked heart to meet bravely the fate that was before them. It was but a little while before, that they had come to surmise that Jesus was the Messiah. When at last they saw realized in him this highest Ideal of the nation's hope, they beheld a Messiah who contradicted all the expectations in which they had been educated. There were hours and days of sore inward conflict. Jesus was neither able nor did he desire to spare them, although one of the disciples he saw more and more clearly was not to come forth from these trials victorious. The nearer the time came to set out for Judea, the less able were the disciples to conceal from themselves that the work of Jesus in that quarter would be attended by the most serious dangers to themselves, the more did their disquiet increase and their failing courage disable them for energetic action. It is these misgivings that explain for us why the disciples were unable to relieve a child mentally diseased.[1] They lacked the exultant vigor and self-confidence of faith, which alone is powerful enough to restore body and soul to health when fearfully shattered. For the same reason they were unable to make a right use of those means of spiritual strength, — prayer and fasting. They had not that intimate communion with God, and that self-command in the enjoyment of earthly things, necessary to vigorous

[1] Mark ix. 17; Matt. xvii. 15; Luke ix. 38.

moral efforts,[1] without which the purification and elevation of the inner life do not reach the state that can alone enable us to exercise a soothing and healing power upon perturbed and suffering minds.

2. By the discipline which they had undergone in self-reliant activity the disciples had, however, become more earnest. Their labors in behalf of the divine kingdom had daily brought home to their consciences that a great task was imposed on them. If they had not yet attained to full clearness in regard to its highest end, they felt themselves influenced by it in the liveliest manner. This state of their minds Jesus sought to render conducive to new and higher enlightenment. Before departing for Judea he gathered them, therefore, around him in the first scene of their labors in Capernaum, and gave utterance to a series of prophecies, the fulfilment of which, in the conflict with the stern difficulties that awaited them, would give them comfort, strength, and a just confidence.

We recollect that the forming principle of the life of Jesus is humility. This it was that protected him at the very outset of his public career from the temptation to self-exaltation. It opened his heart to the poor. It kept strong his sympathy with the oppressed and the suffering of the land. It made it possible for him to contemn all the show of worldly power, and accept a lot of shame and obloquy, in order to impart to the people the solace of a brighter future, and establish among men the kingdom of truth and righteousness and love. His disciples, — they too would become powerful in the service of his kingdom by receiving into the hearts the same spirit. Their exposure to self-exaltation had greatly increased from the moment

[1] Mark ix. 29; Matt. xvii. 21.

Jesus was recognized by them in his Messianic dignity. The trusted and chief servants of the Messiah, appointed by himself, — what a seductive charm for Galilean fishermen in the thought! In setting before them an ignominious death as the first consequence of his labors as the Messiah, he possibly meant, so they thought, only to try their fidelity; he could not be serious. Their future employments and their position in the coming kingdom formed the chief topic of conversation among them after his last disclosures. Why had they received the gifts and powers of the spirit? To what purpose were they to expose themselves to trouble and danger? The reward could not fail. And for which of them was the highest position designed? They inflamed one another with their ambitious projects. Strife broke out among them and bitter words. Jesus had long seen their proud hopes. Now before the decisive journey to Jerusalem, duty required him to speak to them very seriously.

The root of their delusion was pride. Before they had achieved anything, they were entertaining high thoughts of their power. Before they had sown, they would reap. Before they had made the sacrifice, they would have the joy. Jesus sought to shame them into self-knowledge. They were to be convinced of their error, not by words, but by an example. He placed a child before them, took it in his arms and declared that to be as a child was the indispensable condition of all right work in his kingdom. "Whoever will be first must be the last of all, and the servant of all."[1] The ambition of his disciples was to be governed by this rule. By disputing about rank they showed that they had not yet any idea of the kingdom of God. In that

[1] Mark ix. 35.

kingdom there is no temporal power, there are no distinctions of rank. All its members are united by the bond of perfect equality. One may indeed distinguish himself above another, but not as under the Old Testament theocracy, not as in the Messiah's kingdom which the Jews looked for, by eminence of position, but by extraordinary moral attainments. Self-sacrifice, self-abnegation, devotion of all that one has and is to the service of all, is the way to the highest honor in the kingdom of God. Such is the significance of the word of Jesus when he requires his disciples to be converted and become as little children.[1]

The love of children, reverence for childhood, is a striking characteristic of Jesus himself. But it is not in harmony with the idea that he held man to be essentially depraved, and that he required the complete conversion of every man's nature. His admonition to become like children presupposes beyond all question that human nature in the child is as yet undepraved. Selfishness and pride, the two prime vices of the grown-up man, have not woven themselves round the child's heart, and evil inclinations, although slumbering in the child, have not yet grown into passions or broken forth into vices. In the eyes of Jesus the child is emphatically a type of humility. The child makes no claim upon men and upon life. He accepts his condition as it is, and knows how to adjust himself thereto, however humble and limited it may be. This child-like temper Jesus must needs require above all things of his disciples, in order that they might be efficient instruments in his kingdom. The hierarchical party derided the idea. They had reared a proud edifice, founded in ambition and the greed of selfish enjoy-

[1] Matt. xviii. 3.

ment; and the future kingdom of the Messiah, for which they longed so passionately, was to gratify their ambition and their greed in a far more abundant measure than the Old Testament order of things. In direct opposition to this expectation Jesus established his Community upon self-devotion and cheerful self-sacrifice; and as he himself from the first always served others, making no personal claim, so he enjoined it upon his disciples to seek their true glory and their highest honor in the constant humble service of their countrymen and of mankind.

The common idea is that it was the opinions which they held of his person that were the conditions upon which his disciples took position in his kingdom. He certainly required them, as he required every one who proposed to join him, above all things to have faith in his person. But it was not any precise opinion that was meant by this faith, any speculative apprehension, but a bent and disposition of mind, a prevailing tone of feeling. Whosoever was resolved to devote himself to the kingdom of God announced by Jesus could do so with a good conscience only in the full conviction that Jesus had commission and authority from God to establish such a kingdom. He must recognize in Jesus the Messenger of God, in the highest sense of the word. And whosoever joined Jesus, since he acknowledged him as the Messiah, must free himself from the old traditional hope of the Messiah, and hail Jesus as the person whose mission it was to offer himself as a sacrifice for the salvation of his country and mankind. Jesus necessarily and most especially required those who joined him to come to him with entire good will, to throw open their hearts to him in full trust. But for himself, he made no claim

to be personally honored and glorified. He was profoundly humble. As, upon the occasion just referred to, he pronounced childlikeness the first mark of a true disciple, so he himself manifested his humility in this, that he desired for himself no special acknowledgment beyond what awaited all who were possessed of a childlike spirit, and that he esteemed a friendly office done for the least of his friends as highly as if he himself were the object of it. He never asked for himself exclusive homage. Every tender, childlike spirit in the kingdom of God, although showing its quality in the least things and the smallest, had in his eyes priceless worth and divine significance. Consequently he had no wish to take the place of a head, to whom all the members were bound to render submissive service. Devoid of pretension, he stood in the midst of his Church, bound to it most vitally, melted into it in sympathy with the highest and holiest. That in this Communion each should be aided by all, and that the lowly especially, the obscure, those who were working in silence, seeking not to make themselves of importance, should be lifted up and strengthened and encouraged by all, — this seemed to him an essential aim of his mission.

3. The nearer the final decision approached, so much the more, for a special reason, Jesus must have wished to suppress any further manifestation in his disciples of a proud and selfish spirit. Gentiles had already entered the circle of the evangelical Communion. What an offence to them, in so intimate a relation, must have been a temper of mind not yet free from Jewish arrogance! Among the friends of his cause there were individuals of little force of character, who, in conflict with themselves, had not

yet joined his Communion. These friends who stood at a distance from him he was unwilling to lose through the fanatical zeal of his disciples. The danger in this direction was not trifling. The "son of thunder," John, took great offence at a man who, without formally belonging to the company of the disciples,[1] had sought to heal in the name of Jesus. He, John, had forbidden this man to make any further attempts of the kind. Jesus gravely rebuked his officious disciple for so doing. The disciples, lacking humility, lack tolerance also. Pride is the rank source of intolerant judgments. Jesus immediately availed himself of this incident to enlarge the narrow views of his disciples. "Whosoever is not against us," he exclaimed to them, "is for us."[2] The man so harshly dealt with by John had acted in the name of Jesus, although probably with a very imperfect appreciation of the significance of his person and the greatness and importance of his Cause. All circumstances considered, the man was not against him; it was not to be apprehended that he would join with those defamers in high places who dared without shame to stigmatize as of the Devil the holy and beneficent spirit that lived and wrought in Jesus. The position of a well-wisher to the cause of the Gospel is to be considered a friendly one. It is not intellectual insight into the quality of his person and the ultimate aim of his work, but good-will, the confiding, cordial, child-like humility with which one regards Jesus and his Cause, — this it is that establishes a claim to the sympathy of the Communion founded by him. In the case above mentioned, such sympathy appeared to Jesus to be possible without any formal adhesion to

[1] Mark ix. 38; Luke ix. 49. [2] Mark ix. 40; Luke ix. 50.

his person. How important was it at that moment to prepare the hearts of his disciples thus generously to estimate those who, although not belonging to their Communion, were yet kindly disposed at heart! When Jesus should disappear from among them, and the maintenance of his Cause should be in their hands, it would be a matter of the gravest moment whether the Community, founded by him, should really mark a new era in the history of Israel, or whether it should figure only as a new patch on an old garment. If the disciples, with narrow minds, shut themselves up again in the narrow confines of Jewish tradition, — if they continued to adhere to the prejudices of their hereditary religion and of a conventional morality, — if they did not boldly venture, with the original power of the Founder of their Communion, to break through old forms and go down to the deepest roots of Divine truth and of the eternal life itself, — then would Jesus have taught and toiled, lived and suffered in vain.

"Whosoever is not against me is for me." This was said with particular reference to the Gentiles striving after truth and having the ability and the will to appreciate Jesus, not indeed as the Messiah of Israel, but as a moral and religious reformer. This saying is directly contradicted by another saying uttered by Jesus with direct reference to the shameless calumnies which the Pharisees threw out against him: "Whosoever is not with me is against me; whoever gathers not with me, scatters abroad."[1] But there is really no contradiction. The meaning of this saying is determined by the circumstances. An individual, unacquainted with the high purpose of Jesus, but filled with confidence in his Cause and with love to him, —

[1] Matt. xii. 30.

a friend, a man who had not attained to any conscious understanding of the Gospel, but of whom however it might be confidently hoped that the full light of evangelical truth would yet rise upon him, — it was of such an one that Jesus said: "Whosoever is not against me is for me." Other persons again, in like manner unacquainted with his purpose, but incapable of understanding it through their opposition to evangelical truth, inflamed with deep hatred alike of his person and his Cause, enemies, men who had neither taken middle ground between the parties nor hesitated between them, but who from the first had been decidedly against him, and who, on this very account, because a decision involved their dearest personal prejudices, were with all the clearer consciousness *against* him, — these it was in allusion to whom Jesus said: "Whosoever is not with me, is against me.(*a*)

It was not the position in which the disciples stood to the Pharisees that constituted the special subject of discourse upon the eve of the journey into Judea, but their relation to the people of Israel and to the Gentiles whom the disciples were commissioned to call into the communion of the kingdom. In discharging this office they would be very liable to make unreasonable demands, and urge claims that could not be satisfied. As to an intellectual comprehension of the Gospel, it was by no means the opinion of Jesus that the requirement should be very strict. The right direction of heart and consciousness, the inner life of a man, showing itself in a true way of living, altogether unimposing perhaps, is with Jesus decisive as to the question of admission into his kingdom. Whosoever should give only a cup of cold water to his disciples, weary and exhausted with their labors, to reinvigorate them for the

service of their Master, would not fail of reward in the kingdom of God. How keen, by the way, was the sight of Jesus, to descry the virtue that was hidden and despised by the world! How truly did he designate those who were ready to receive his kingdom, "the little ones"; and with what indignation does he speak of those who would refuse admission into his Communion to these, the lowly and obscure. Grave offence would thus be given to lowly persons;[1] it would confound all their ideas of the kingdom founded by Jesus. It would thus appear to be established for the great and for their aggrandizement, not a kingdom in which the least as well as the greatest are to be offered and consecrated to God.

As Jesus devoted himself a sacrifice for the country and the world, he required a like devotion from those who gave themselves to him and to his Cause. He therefore represents a willingness to sacrifice one's self as an essential condition of discipleship. The sacrificial salt of suffering must be tasted by every disciple of his. It must be as a purifying fire, and as the seasoning of a higher life. Fire and salt, — the sanctification of suffering, the savor of life: these are the elements of that dark saying found only in Mark: "Every one shall be salted with fire, and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt."[2] Personal development in the Divine kingdom proceeds from low to ever higher states through fire and salt, through the glow of sacrifice and the life of the Spirit. It was in this connection probably that Jesus uttered the saying concerning light and salt, which the first Evangelist introduces in a wrong place.[3] The disciple, conse-

[1] Mark ix. 42; Matt. xviii. 6.

[2] Mark ix. 49.

[3] Matt. v. 13 – 16.

crated as such by sacrifice, becomes the light that shines in a world dark with error and sin; and he who is purified by salt himself becomes the salt that penetrates mankind with a purifying and preserving power. It was only when he was standing at his present elevation, and not at the beginning of his career, that Jesus could liken his disciples to light and salt, only then when he was introducing them into a sphere in which they were to rely only on themselves, only then when, in prospect of soon being separated from them, he set before them their destination, they were to go forth into the world to illumine and purify it. Only then too, we may suppose, did he utter the parables of the tares and the wheat, of the leaven, of the treasure hid in the field, of the pearl of great price, and of the net.[1] These parables all point to the inevitable conflict at hand, the sufferings of which were to be great, but its happy issue was certain and its reward glorious, not however to be realized before the time.

NOTE.

[*a.* p. 60. "*Whosoever is not against me is for me.*" "*Whosoever is not with me is against me.*" M. Renan, in his "Life of Jesus," refers to these two proverbs, — which Jesus happened to quote and apply, each on a peculiar occasion, — as two great contradictory principles by which he was guided in his great work, and excuses him upon the ground that an enthusiastic spirit is always liable to be involved in such contradictions! Nothing could be more egregiously erroneous. A tolerably careful consideration of the two only occasions upon which Jesus made use of these proverbial sayings would have shown M. Renan that his statement is wholly unauthorized. It is worth referring to here how-

[1] Matt. xiii. 24.

ever merely as a specimen of the hasty and superficial treatment which the Gospels have received at the hands of the author of the *Vie de Jésus*, and shows how little dependence is to be placed on his interpretations.

Dr. Schenkel justly remarks that these two proverbs involve no contradiction, as they are to be explained by the circumstances to which they are applied; but he errs, I think, in understanding the second saying, "*Whosoever is not with me is against me, and he that gathereth not with me, scattereth abroad*," as applied by Jesus to himself in the same way in which upon another occasion he applied to himself the first mentioned, "*Whosoever is not against me, is for me.*" It is in his answer to the charge that he was in league with the Prince of the evil spirits, that he quoted the familiar saying, "He that is not with me is against me." And the whole aim of that part of the answer with which the proverb stands connected shows that it was to "Satan," or "Beelzebub," that the proverb was applied, and the point of the application is: "Satan is like a strong man whose house cannot be entered and despoiled by any one who has not first overcome the strong man. I have despoiled his house, — I have cast out his servants, therefore the inevitable conclusion is that I am not with him. And as I am thus evidently not *with* him, I am against him." The other proverb, "He that is not against me is for me," was applied by Jesus to the case of the stranger whom his disciples found casting out demons in the name of Jesus. All that was known of this man showed that he was not *against* Jesus. Therefore it was a case for the proverbial presumption that he was *for* Jesus. Dr. Schenkel thinks that Jesus in quoting it had "particular reference to the Gentiles striving after truth and having the will and the ability to appreciate Jesus." That it admits of such a reference may be conceded. But that Jesus intended this application of it does not appear, and there is no ground for supposing it.— TRANS.]

CHAPTER XV.

BEFORE THE DEPARTURE FOR THE FINAL CONFLICT.

1. After the preparatory discourse of Jesus to his more immediate disciples in Capernaum, there occurs in the first two Gospels an evident *hiatus* in the narrative.[1] Without any explanation the scene of the labors of Jesus is suddenly changed to Judea. The original record appears here to have been imperfect. But the diligence of Luke has happily supplied the deficiency. From materials accessible to him alone he has related the last eventful journey of Jesus through Samaria to Jerusalem.

Fully aware of the consequences which this transfer of his labors from the remote shores of the Lake of Gennesaret to the capital of the Jewish hierarchy must have for him, Jesus had resolved to sacrifice his life for the truth of his Gospel, for the salvation of his people and mankind. He had put out of sight all personal considerations, and chosen Jerusalem itself, the proud city of David and of the Temple, for the goal of his earthly career.[2] Before starting with the little company of his more immediate disciples upon this journey, which led through a country hostile to the Jews, Samaria, he sent out before him a considerable number of persons, probably in small parties, chosen from his disciples at large, in order to practise their fresh powers on the new soil, and in order also to prepare them for the fearful events that awaited his whole Church. Before their departure he had several times

[1] Mark x. 1; Matt. xix. 1. [2] Luke ix. 51.

gathered the larger circle of his disciples around him, and given them such instructions as they appeared to him to need. Not a few of these utterances have been put by the first Evangelist in the great composition, "The Sermon on the Mount," where they are only in part intelligible. They find their right place and full significance only in the connection which we have just indicated.

When at an earlier period Jesus sent out the Twelve, he forbade them to enter any Gentile country, or Samaria.[1] The first trial of their strength, in order to have results, was to be made within the borders of their own native land. This prohibition was now cancelled, Jesus had declared himself the Redeemer of all nations. An immeasurable field of labor was thrown open to the view of the disciples, who now went forth on a broader mission. Not Israel alone, but nation after nation presented itself, ripe for the harvest, before the eyes of Jesus and of those whom he chose. And how few were those who had until now been sent as laborers into the harvest field! Samaria, through which the way led, naturally claimed the first attention of those who were sent. Here as they passed through the country the disciples were to carry the evangelical message of peace to the people in their habitations, for peace above all things they needed who had no spiritual, living communion with the living God, the God made known by Jesus. Unrest among the Gentiles, a hollow show of rest among the Jews. According to the strict Pharisaical law, Jews — and Jews the messengers of Jesus yet were — could have no friendly intercourse with Gentiles and Samaritans; they were not to enter their houses,

[1] Matt. x. 5.

return their salutations, still less eat and drink with them at the same table. The fundamental principles of toleration and humanity, which Jesus had already set forth among his more intimate disciples, were now to be made commanding in the larger company of his followers. The partition walls between Jews and Gentiles or Samaritans had fallen before the Saviour of all men. Without hesitation the messengers of peace sent forth by Jesus were to mingle freely with such as were not their religious associates. They were to make only one condition: an acceptance in faith of the salvation which they announced, and which was offered in the Communion of the kingdom of God.

Jesus had at this period already arrived at a conviction of mind most rich in consequences. It was no longer a question with him that the Gentile world would receive the Gospel more readily than his own countrymen. Long as he had been teaching in the cities of Galilee, and notwithstanding the admiring crowds that flocked to gaze at him, notwithstanding the sensation produced by his teaching, how disproportionally small was the number of those who were truly and permanently converted! A wail of sorrow burst from his heart at this reflection. That heart glowed with love for his country. He was conscious of his Jewish blood. Gladly would he above all things prepare the way for the deliverance of his people. But they would not suffer themselves to be liberated from the moral and spiritual bondage in which they languished. The yoke of the Romans was not their heaviest burden; far heavier was the yoke of the dead-letter, the pedantry of stiff forms and formulas by which every movement of religious freedom and every exercise of moral power was held fast under the ban of the Statute. Even the highest

ideal of Israel, the idea of the Messiah, had become a fanciful creation, the centre of a dream of universal empire, to the realization of which all the necessary conditions were wanting. Deep-rooted and numerous as the errors and sins of the heathen world might be, however wide-spread voluptuousness, luxury, and all the wild tumult of the senses, yet a conversion to a better life was far more to be expected from heathen levity than from Jewish arrogance sunk in dead orthodoxy. Jesus therefore cherished better hopes of Tyre and Sidon, those central seats of heathendom, than of Capernaum, where he had begun and so long continued his labors as a deliverer of the people.[1]

2. Before setting out for Judea, Jesus waited for the return of those whom he had sent forth. They brought him most cheering accounts. He was the more rejoiced to receive this intelligence, as it was a pledge of his ultimate victory over the powers of darkness, over the hierarchical despotism, the theological pride, and the deadly hatred of truth, in a decisive conflict with which he was about to engage. Before he parted forever from the accustomed sphere of his labors, which had grown so dear to him; before he quitted the home of his youth, the smiling shores of the Lake of Galilee, and well-known and familiar friends, in order to make the last sacrifice for the work of his life; he withdrew with the chosen few to that quiet spot where he had so often rested from the cares and toils of his calling. Here with his confidential friends he spent one of the most exciting hours of his life. An extraordinary feeling of triumph took possession of him. Now, when the worst that could befall him was yet in prospect, his heart became light. All wavering was

[1] Luke x. 13.

at an end, all anxiety was banished, all darkness disappeared. Already in the spirit he had conquered the foe. He saw Satan fall like lightning from heaven.[1] It was the hierarchical party, its mightiest resistance to him, that he now regarded as overcome. In calling it the "Satan" that sought to defeat his work as a Deliverer, he was perfectly right. He is exhilarated by the anticipation of the triumph, the fruits of which his disciples were especially to enjoy. Deeply penetrated by the conviction to which of old such glowing expression was given by the singer of the ninety-first Psalm, namely, that whosoever is under the protection of the Highest sits under the shadow of the Almighty, he knows no fear, he suffers himself to feel no dread of the serpents and scorpions that lurk in his way. He knows that the spirits of the world will be subject to him and his followers. But what most he rejoices in is that his Father in heaven has put his seal to the great work of his life, and has "written the names of his disciples" in the book of the living.

Through this exaltation of mind, an entirely new point of view was gained. Then and thenceforth were solved for Jesus the enigmas of the order of the world's development in general, and of the guidance of life in particular. It is not the visible result that determines inward worth. The claim to true dignity, to empire over minds, rests not on external honor and official power. Life and the world are ruled by the eternal ideas of truth, freedom, righteousness, love, as represented by Jesus in immediate communion with God. Only in its accord with the Spirit of God himself is there worth and significance in human striving and working. Salvation is therefore never dependent

[1] Luke x. 18.

upon external conditions. Taking this view, man gives up outward good without pain. The possession of the eternal, supreme good, can alone content him. Suffering, privation, persecution, the bitter cup of death, — all is gain when the jewel of truth, of peace, of eternal life is purchased therewith. Whoever occupies this point of view with full conviction and thorough fidelity is invincible. He may be defeated, but through defeat he comes to an ever more intimate and triumphant consciousness of power. He dies only in death to conquer death. In chains he is free, and from his prison-house shakes and moves the world. This is the secret of the new doctrine which Jesus teaches, of the new life which he kindles. Through faith in the supreme good which Jesus showed, and through willing self-sacrifice in the service of the eternal life, there have been born in humanity, in the fullest vigor, powers before undreamed of, powers of which the world before Christ had no surmise, and to the exercise of which therefore it could not have grown up. From the height of this faith we understand the fervent thanks to which Jesus gave utterance, as he stood among his disciples at the beginning of his eventful journey through Samaria to Judea.[1] We see that he praised the Father, the Lord of heaven and of earth, because he had hidden this great power of faith from the wise and revealed it to babes. The first Evangelist also has preserved this passage for us, without noting, however, the connection in which it was uttered by Jesus.[2] What appeared to Jesus worthy of special thanks, as the innermost mystery of the kingdom of God, was the enduring moral power, the heroic strength, growing ever more assured, and proceeding from a faithful

[1] Luke x. 21.

[2] Matt. xi. 25.

and self-sacrificing devotion to the highest good of men and of nations.

But was it then an occasion of thanks that this power had been kept hidden from the wise (*a*) and been revealed to babes? Would it not have been desirable that those learned in the law, the theologians and churchmen, — who are to be understood by the wise and prudent, — should have obtained a right idea of that mystery and made it their own? That remarkable thanksgiving opens for us a deep look into the significance of the great work of Jesus. The divine Communion of the New Covenant was to rest, not upon the learning of the schools and official authority, not on theology and the clergy, not on privileged classes, but on childlike faith and the humble love of the popular heart. It was to be built not from above downwards by the hands of the powerful, but from below upwards. It was to spring from the good-will and pure aims of those who were without power and influence. It was to grow up, a genuine natural plant of our Heavenly Father.

By the "babes" Jesus does not mean only his followers of Jewish descent. In choosing this expression he had in mind the Samaritans also, and Gentiles, to whom thenceforth the Divine kingdom was to be announced. They who would fain fashion the Christian Church from above downwards, have never duly pondered the thank-offering of Jesus. That would show them that he put his trust in the middle and lower orders, weak and defective though they be; while from the privileged classes, from learned corporations and spiritual dignitaries, and especially from the ecclesiastical régime of his day, he had nothing to expect but everything to fear. He saw the fulfilment of the

divine order of the world, the plan of salvation in the fact, which may well surprise a superficial judgment, that the upholders of spiritual power, the guardians of the traditions of the Church, had no appreciation of the new state of things which he introduced, while the childlike spirit of the people, the simple understanding of the laity, accepted it willingly. The way is almost always opened for new periods of development and progress, particularly in religion and morals, from below. They are born of the fulness and energy of the robust, living spirit of the people, after the higher classes, in consequence of spiritual exhaustion and moral decay, have become incapable of creating new institutions, and in their selfish dependence on their privileges, averse to all change.

3. Upon one point it was necessary, before setting out for Judea, that Jesus should be more distinctly understood by his disciples. It was only by degrees, as we have seen, that he came to the full consciousness of his destiny as the Saviour of the world. His disciples had not by any means kept equal progress with him in his inward development. They had indeed recognized him at last as the most exalted personage of whom from their Jewish point of view they were able to conceive, the Messiah. But everything was still depending upon what they thought the office of the Messiah to be. It was in no forced accommodation to the ideas and expectations of the people and the time, that Jesus had assumed the title and dignity of a Messiah. It cannot be too often repeated that it could not possibly be his destiny and design to be a Messiah, i. e. a theocratic king, in the Old Testament sense. Rather was he destined and resolved to annihilate forever the dream of a theocratic, Messianic

kingdom of the future. The Messiah was to be, above all things, a liberator and saviour of his country. He was to be endowed with divine power and a regal sanctity, and as the representative of God upon earth, to found a kingdom embracing the world. By a Divine commission he was to establish a Communion of the "holy God" amongst the nations. And thus, according to the highly symbolical modes of speech used in the East, he was the "Son of God," begotten and anointed of God himself, a man in whom God was well pleased. The error lay only in the fact that the Messianic kingdom was conceived of as an external institution, and it was expected to be established through the agency of external means. But of all who had ever spoken to men in the name and authority of God, Jesus was the most profoundly conscious of moral and spiritual communion with the Highest. As a man God-related, anointed in the Spirit, all glowing with the holiest love and inspired by the Divinest thoughts, he felt himself, we may well believe, the true fulfiller of the Messianic idea. As a mediator between the human and Divine, as the highest personal organ of the revealed will and love of God, as, in a manner, the only Son of the heavenly Father, who has made all men to be his children, as the first-born brother alike of Samaritans and Gentiles, — such he now recognized himself to be. And to offer to all the true peace drawn from the highest source of truth and life eternal, to offer it through the Jewish national spirit, cleansed and consecrated by him, was what had now dawned fully upon him as the supreme purpose of his calling and of his life. But as in all his teachings concerning himself and his work he avoided laying down theological formulas, and always aimed directly

at practical ends, so was it also in those lofty utterances of his in regard to his personal dignity and greatness at that interesting moment of setting out for Judea.

"All is delivered to me by my Father,"[1] said he to his disciples. A word which without the necessary qualification could have no meaning, or only the wholly inadmissible one, that the Father having sent the Son upon the earth, reserved no power for himself! But the connection necessarily limits the universal term to the particular which in the Providence of God had been hidden from the "wise and prudent, and revealed to 'babes,'" namely, the carrying out of the work of salvation, the establishment of the Divine kingdom through the power of suffering undergone for the sake of the supreme good.

Thus, beyond all question, Jesus was profoundly convinced that the great work assigned him by the Father could be accomplished by him only by virtue of his personal qualities, and in consequence of the intimate union in which he stood with the Father, and which was repeated in no other being. "No one knows who the Son is but the Father, and no one knows who the Father is but the Son and he to whom the Son will reveal him."[2] As is evident from this remarkable declaration, the establishment of Christianity in the Jewish and Gentile worlds had become possible only as there was found in the person of its Founder a new, clear, creative consciousness of God. It is true God (Jehovah-Elohim) was already declared by the Holy Scriptures of the Old Covenant as the Father of Israel and Ruler of the nations. But in this representation there was no living acknowledgment of

[1] Luke x. 22; Matt. xi. 27. [2] Luke x. 22: Matt. xi. 27.

the universal spirit and love of God. God was honored and loved as the peculiar God of Israel, revealing himself within the limits which he himself had set, in the theocratic ordinances and institutions. In Jesus the consciousness of God is freed from all forms and limitations. He proclaimed God as Him before whom no personal dignity, no official position, no spiritual or priestly privilege, no time-honored tradition or statute is in itself of any worth, but only the inmost animating life of the personal character, a true conscience, purity of heart, a faith full of power. God is really known, — according to the teaching of Jesus, — only in the authority of conscience, in a pure heart, in a fervid faith; and he communicates his own life only to those who seek it through immediate communion with Him in the spirit and in actual, daily life. All other modes of mediation only darken and distort the divine idea in man. Accordingly Jesus recognized God as no other ever had done, immediately, with the living spirit, originally. His consciousness of the divine was not reflected on his soul from the dim mirror of tradition, by the broken lights of school-theologies, aided by the watchwords of religious parties. In the mysterious deeps of his own self-consciousness, in the purest and most secret revelations of his own spirit, he became conscious of God as his Father. He has communicated this consciousness immediately, in all its freshness, to his Church, and has disclosed the spirit and truth of God to humanity itself.[1]

4. It is accordingly in altogether an extraordinary and peculiar character that Jesus represents himself. But we must take care lest we attribute more to his self-assertion than lay in his thought. That he laid

[1] See Appendix, III. 18, p. 74.

claim to a wholly new consciousness of God, such as had never before been experienced, and consequently that he was in most intimate union with God, that he regarded his personal being as an inexhaustible source of truth and life to mankind, — so much is beyond all question. But he has not therefore claimed for himself Divine power and dignity. He has not asserted that he was possessed of the attributes of Omnipotence and Omniscience. He has not placed the "Son" as a second adorable person by the side of the first, "the Father." That nothing was farther from his thought than to make such a claim is certified by a word uttered on the same solemn occasion, and preserved for us by the first Evangelist alone, who probably took it from the Collection of Sayings. Jesus is in the first Gospel reported to have turned from the small circle of his immediate disciples to the larger company of those who were ready to receive the Divine kingdom. He called them to him as the weary and heavy laden. Upon their shoulders the Jewish priests and scribes had flung the heavy yoke of their requirements, and thus the burdens by which they were weighed down were made still heavier. Jesus invited them to take upon them his yoke. Long years of bitter experience had taught them the pride, the selfishness of the priestly caste who, considering themselves the God-ordained guardians and guides of the people, used them for their own aggrandizement. "Look to me," cries Jesus, "I am gentle and lowly of heart."[1] As I am, so is the burden which I impose, gentle and not oppressive. How could he have possibly spoken thus, had he claimed for himself Divine power and knowledge? Only a man liable to anger can call himself

[1] Matt. xi. 29.

"gentle." Only a man exposed to the temptation of pride can style himself "lowly." He could well use such language who, in earnest communion with God, discerned most clearly the truth, the holy will and the love of God, and was called to make known this truth, this will, this love to mankind; he might speak thus whose work it was, upon the ruins of a crumbling world, to establish a new order of things; so he could speak as a man divinely endowed and commissioned, but not as God.

That there was in him the creative energy of a new development of humanity had now become to him an unquestionable certainty. The lonely path on which he had entered led to the deliverance of mankind. Well might he say that happy were the eyes that beheld this sunrise, and the ears that caught the rustling of this spring-time. The most illustrious prophets, the devoutest kings of Israel had seen and heard nothing like it. A new age had dawned. An old world was in process of destruction. What signified the sufferings, the agonies that were approaching, in contrast with this commanding consciousness of carrying in his God-illuminated heart the fulness of a new age, and of being the creator of a better future than princes and nations had ever yet dreamed of! To labor for this future, to bring it to pass and determine its destinies, — this was the highest blessedness.[1]

[1] Luke x. 23; Matt. xiii. 16.

NOTE.

[*a*. p. 70. In the exposition of the passage found in Matt. xi. 25, and Luke x. 21, where Jesus is recorded as saying, according to the Common Version: "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes," Dr. Schenkel overlooks "an idiom frequent in Matthew's Gospel, and found elsewhere in the New Testament. Two propositions are made, or two questions asked, which are not to be considered as independent propositions or questions. The former of the two merely expresses some condition, real or supposed, which is to be viewed in connection with the latter. They both constitute but one complex proposition or question, of which the former is to be regarded only as a conditional clause. The verb contained in it may sometimes be rendered as a participle, but often better in the conditional mood with some conjunction, as *if* or *though*." (See *A Translation of the Gospels with Notes by Andrews Norton*, note on Matt. vii. 22, 23, where numerous instances of this idiom are referred to.) Accordingly the passage above referred to, correctly translated, reads thus: "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that *since thou hast hid* these things from the wise and prudent, thou hast revealed them unto babes." Jesus is thus relieved from the appearance of thanking God for hiding the truth from the wise. A striking instance of the same idiom occurs Rom. vi. 17. "But God be thanked that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart," &c. Rightly rendered this text reads: "But God be thanked that *though* ye were the servants of sin, ye have obeyed," &c. — TRANS.]

FIFTH SECTION.

SPHERE OF ACTION IN JUDEA.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE SCHOOL OF ENDURANCE.

1. Considering the hostility which had arisen between the Jews and the Samaritans through the ascendency gained by the theology of the Jewish school sharpening their religious differences, we cannot wonder that in one of the first Samaritan districts bordering on Judea, Jesus was refused a hospitable reception.[1] The journey was not indeed interrupted in consequence, but the circumstance was annoying. The two Sons of Thunder, John and James, were greatly offended at the rudeness with which they were treated. On the very first occasion it was evident that they had not yet overcome the hierarchical bigotry which accounted every one who was not a Jew an enemy of God, and which would build up and maintain the kingdom of God, not by gentleness and love, but by stern force. In their opinion fire ought to be invoked from heaven to consume the people of the inhospitable region.[2] For such wrathful zeal they could certainly find authority in Old Testament precedents. To Ahaziah, a king of Samaria, who, being very sick sought help from the idol Baal, it had been

[1] Luke ix. 52. [2] Luke ix. 54.

announced by the prophet Elijah, that he should be punished with death for his apostasy from the living God. The warriors sent by the king to seize Elijah were at the prayer of the prophet all consumed by fire from heaven.[1] The two disciples would fain have doomed the inhospitable Samaritans to a similar fate. How difficult was it for Jesus, even at this late hour, and notwithstanding his oft-repeated, most loving endeavors, to soften the hard hearts of his disciples! What deep roots had their fanatical Jewish zeal struck into their natures! How wanting were they still in patience with the erring, and how prompt to think only of punishing and destroying them! They were not yet able to understand that the kingdom of Jesus was a kingdom of faith, of faith that works not by wrath, and that it was not by the force of punishment that that kingdom was to be maintained, — that it springs from humility and love, rests upon free, cordial conviction, and is strengthened and confirmed only when watched over and maintained by a pious, childlike mind.

Deeply saddened, but also highly indignant, Jesus turned to the zealots and rebuked their senseless and unmerciful severity.[2] Still unable were they to raise their views above the Messianic representation of the Old Covenant. Still occasionally the figure of their Master was eclipsed by a vision of the king who was to "break the heathen with an iron rod, and dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel,[3] and fill the places with dead bodies, and wound the heads over many countries."[4] They had heard it is true from his own lips that he had come not to rule but to serve, to endure suffering not to inflict it. He had just disclosed to

[1] 2 Kings i. 2. [2] Luke ix. 55. Consult App., Ill. 19, p. 79.
[3] Ps. ii. 9. [4] Ps. cx. 6.

them, also, as the secret of his office as the Messiah, the suffering which he was to pass through, the sacrifice of his life that he was to make. But what their ears had heard and their consciences acknowledged, had failed to touch their hearts; and relapses into Jewish fanaticism were the certain consequence.

Unstipulating service in the divine kingdom, unconditional devotion to God's will, entire renunciation of all private interests came extremely hard to the disciples; for serving is always associated with suffering. A second incident of the last journey through Samaria shows us particularly why Jesus had to insist so peremptorily upon his demand for service and suffering from those who would attach themselves to him and his cause. It was not a scribe, as the first Evangelist erroneously states,[1] but a Samaritan, as the third informs us,[2] who, impressed by the Evangelical preaching, sought to become a disciple of Jesus, and, by his declaration to this effect, gave reason to believe that the Samaritans were not all like the inhabitants of that inhospitable village. But he seems to have had no idea of the purpose of Jesus. For when Jesus, concealing not from him what under the then circumstances awaited his disciples, told him that he himself was on his last journey, that he had left house and home forever, that the beasts of the field, and the birds of the air had a comfortable and enviable lot in comparison with his,[3] the man retracted. Jesus had now to require of those who were resolved to share his lot, not only patience towards others, but resolution for the endurance of all possible hardship.

These circumstances explain the apparent harshness with which he treated two other Samaritans whom he

[1] Matt. viii. 19. [2] Luke iv. 57. [3] Luke ix. 58.

summoned to follow him. The condition of things was very different from that existing during his abode in Galilee. It had not then become actually necessary for every one who would follow him to leave house and hearth, the nearest and dearest, and make up his mind to the worst. Now he was approaching the last momentous crisis in a sphere of action, where an abode of his own, home ties, friends, a population for the most part well-disposed, no longer afforded a certain sense of security and protection. He was now entering surroundings where the powers of darkness, hatred, and persecution pointed at him their poisoned and fatal weapons. He must now require of every one who joined him the most positive and unreserved devotion, a willingness for self-sacrifice that knew no limits. To one who wished, before joining him, to discharge the last offices to the nearest relative, Jesus now said: "Let the dead (those whom the proclamation of the heavenly kingdom does not awaken) bury their dead";[1] resign the last loving pressure of the hand, for the entreaties, the tears, of thy loved ones may shake thy resolve; submit, endure even this pang, break the dearest ties to bind thyself by the holiest, give up the most precious earthly good for the highest good, for that heavenly treasure which alone can bless thee.[2] It is no doubt to be regretted that the third Gospel has preserved for us only these scanty notices of the journey through Samaria. But even from these few incidents we gather that this journey was a school of endurance for the disciples; that from

[1] Luke ix. 60; Matt. viii. 22.

[2] Luke ix. 60. The incident related Matt. viii. 18, does not belong here, but fits into the last period of the public life of Jesus. At the time in which Matthew places it, Jesus still had his own home, and therefore could not say that he had not where to lay his head.

its very beginning they were exercised in privation, endurance, resignation, in self-command and self-renunciation.

2. The fourth Gospel, however, has handed down to us one event that occurred on this journey, which bears on its face the seal of credibility. Wearied with travel, Jesus arrived at the so-called well of Jacob, near the city of Sichem, and there, after his manner, fell into an animated conversation with a woman who came there for water. The fourth Evangelist is obviously under the erroneous impression that this incident took place during a journey made by Jesus homewards from Judea to Galilee, according to his mistaken supposition that Jesus frequently passed to and fro between Galilee and Judea. But the fact that Jesus at once announced himself the Messiah to the woman,[1] shows that the incident related occurred on his final journey through Samaria to Judea. Before his preparation for this last journey he had not once made any communication concerning his Messianic character even to his most intimate disciples. But this journey was undertaken as the declared Messiah resolved upon suffering and death. And it is in this view that we come to understand the words: "the fields are white to harvest."[2] The disciples who had not sown were now to reap. He was to leave the field of labor, they were to enter it. And it was those, the Apostles, whom he had sent forth last, whom Jesus had in mind when he said: "Other men labored and ye are entered into their labors."[3]

In the conversation of Jesus with the Samaritan woman is struck the key-note of all that Jesus said and did upon this journey. It may be pronounced the lof-

[1] John iv. 26. [2] John iv. 35. [3] John iv. 38.

tiest plea for toleration. How perfectly human, how entirely free from all Jewish prejudice is he in this conversation with the woman of Samaria! How gently does he treat her grave feminine transgressions! With what a large heart does he express himself in regard to the worship of God and its manifold forms! Jerusalem or Gerizim, — it is alike indifferent. There is no worth before God in the place or the form of worship. The true divine worship is in the inmost being of man, in his spirit and heart. The living spirit, communion with God, the mind devoutly occupied with truth and with the supreme source of truth, — this is the true worship.[1] This moral, spiritual character of divine worship is the necessary result of the new consciousness of God that Jesus creates in humanity, the conscious knowledge of God as the infinite spirit.[2] The standpoint of the ante-Christian religions, the fundamental principle of religious separation and exclusiveness, was thus abjured and abolished. The religion of humanity was established. Samaritan, Heathen, Jew, are alike children of the Heavenly Father, and the Messiah is "the Saviour of the world."[3] (*a*)

3. How long Jesus tarried with his disciples in Samaria cannot be determined with certainty. The accounts that have come down to us do not authorize the idea that this journey occupied only a few days. He gathered, we may believe, a small Samaritan Communion, for the Samaritans were not wanting in susceptibility to his Gospel. The impression which this journey left upon his mind is most powerfully reflected in the parable of the humane Samaritan.[4]

His arrival in Judea created doubtless no slight sensation, and the leaders of the theological schools and

[1] John iv. 23. [2] John iv. 24. [3] John iv. 42. [4] Luke x. 25.

the representatives of the ecclesiastical power were startled at the appearance of the man, so feared and so admired, in the places in which their ascendency had hitherto been unquestioned. A year had passed since Jesus first appeared in Galilee. In a few months would come the feast of the Passover, and then, as he saw with growing clearness, the crisis could not long be delayed. His opponents doubtless shared also in this presentiment. They had already for some time been seeking occasion for legal proceedings against him. Such an occasion they might have found, had they not stood in awe of the spirit, the fearlessness, the greatness of soul, the popularity, of Jesus. As cunning politicians and churchmen they were resolved to move safely to their end. Hardly had they heard that Jesus had entered Judea, when they despatched an individual versed in the law, instructed to involve him if possible by subtle questions in a contradiction of the requirements of the Mosaic law. He was to be accused and condemned as a transgressor of the law of the fathers, as an offender against what Jews accounted holy. The emissary inquired of Jesus the way to eternal life, trusting to receive an answer that would give the desired handle for a malicious construction. But Jesus gave the scribe no answer. He compelled him to answer the question himself out of the law. He forced from him the confession that the way to eternal life was through perfect love towards God and one's neighbor.[1] Although thus instantly defeated, the questioner still thought to ensnare Jesus. The law decided who is one's neighbor. For a Jew it was a Jew. What Jesus thought upon this point, his opponents well knew from many striking things that had already come to

[1] Luke x. 27.

their ears. His free and friendly intercourse during his journey through Samaria with this heretical people; his explicit declaration that he was not the Messiah of the Jews but of the "world"; his large-hearted views of truth, freedom and divine worship, — all this was known to the spies sent by the high spiritual authorities at Jerusalem to dog his steps. Ought it not then to be possible upon such a groundwork to build a complaint against one whom they so hated? If he dared to say outright that the Gentile, the Samaritan even, was his neighbor, then was he indeed convicted of contempt of the inviolable law of the fathers, and of a want of respect for the sacred privileges of a Jew.

But it was neither Jew, Gentile, nor Samaritan that Jesus declared to the scribe to be his "neighbor." He told a parable of a *man*.[1] A "man," upon the road leading from Jerusalem to Jericho, falls among robbers, who plunder him, wound him, and leave him half dead in the road. Certain Jews, representatives of the "pure doctrine" of the orthodox Church, one an ordained priest, the other a Levite, going that way, seeing the unfortunate man lying there, heartlessly pass by without troubling themselves about his further fate. A Samaritan travelling that road sees the man, takes pity on him, binds up his wounds, and generously provides for him until he is completely restored. The Samaritan treats the poor man as his neighbor, — the Samaritan is the neighbor of the man, because he is a tender-hearted, humane man, and not because he is a Samaritan.

This parable could have come only from the lofty Messianic consciousness of Jesus. It expresses the deepest and most comprehensive import of the divine

[1] Luke x. 30.

kingdom which he established. From the elevated point of view at which this parable was conceived, all the narrow limitations of confessions of faith vanish, and there appears, as the true religion leading to eternal life, the religion of the *love of man*, cleansed from the prejudices of religion and place, from all prepossessions official and national, the religion of the broadest humanity. Let it not be said that Jesus states a principle not of religion but only of morality. Does he not tell us here what we are to do to inherit eternal life? And it is religion that leads us to eternal life. In the parable of the benevolent Samaritan, he has solemnly announced the true religion, human and humane. He has declared himself the Saviour of all men. The priest and the Levite on the other hand, are the everlasting types of that heartless zeal for creeds, which, while it contends for the dead letter, coolly leaves a brother-man to perish, and which, busy with Jews, Turks, Pagans, Catholics, Protestants, Reformed Churches, Lutherans, &c., forgets that God has created Men, and that Jesus has saved Men. The Love of Man purified from sectarian, feudal, and national narrowness, — this, according to the express testimony of Jesus, is the way to eternal life.

4. It was at this time that Jesus became intimately acquainted with a pious family of Bethany. Two sisters, Martha and Mary, had charge of the affairs of the household. During his abode in Judea, Jesus appears to have availed himself repeatedly of their hospitality, and when exhausted by the day's burden and heat, to have found refreshment in their pleasant circle. Both sisters loved and revered him. But they stood in very different relations to him. The elder most probably of the two had not yet a right ap-

preciation of him. She beheld in him a great prophet. Perhaps she placed her hopes in him as the Messiah, the national deliverer. But the secret of his coming sufferings had not yet been revealed to her. When, a few days, we may suppose, after his arrival in Judea, he entered their hospitable house for the first time, the two sisters at once betrayed their respective peculiarities. Martha prepared a bountiful entertainment for him, and was vexed with Mary, who, instead of helping her, lost herself in listening to Jesus. She passed a harsh and hasty judgment upon her apparently indolent sister. Here again then Jesus enjoined tolerance. In the significant word: "One thing is needful," Jesus points away from a spirit busy and useless, to that in the human heart which alone endures and satisfies, — the free, childlike mind, which with unassuming love throws itself wide open to the truth, the simple possession of which is the perennial source of inward refreshment. There is in Luke's Gospel a secret connection between the narratives of the Good Samaritan and the Two Sisters. The pure human love of the Samaritan, which when a man needs help asks not about his circumstances, and the pious, childlike mind of Mary, which, gazing on the spiritual lineaments of her guest, forgets the formal offices of respect, — both spring from the same source, from humble self-forgetting love. But this love itself has its deep root in a God-devoted heart. Violent, blind zeal for forms draws its nourishment from what men have manufactured out of religion. From the cordial piety, that rests upon immediate communion with God, flows the spirit of considerate tenderness and kindly toleration.

NOTE.

[*a.* p. 83. There is one declaration ascribed to Jesus in his conversation with the woman of Samaria, that is so harshly at discord with the grandly broad tone of his memorable utterances on the occasion, that I cannot but regard it as a gloss, which early crept into the text from the hand of some bigoted Jewish transcriber. (See John iv. 22.)

Dr. Schenkel overlooks certain striking illustrations of the nature and character of Jesus, to be found in this narrative of his conversation with the Samaritan woman. What a living proof was he at the moment of the truth of his declaration to this woman, namely, that the possession of what he had to communicate was a spring of living water gushing up within forever! The instant an opportunity offered, although his want of bodily refreshment might at the moment be very urgent, the truth welled up from his heart to his lips, and in what grand utterances did it overflow! And how naturally it refreshed and inspired him thus to give expression to those profound convictions of his, appears immediately afterwards when, in reply to his disciples entreating him to eat what they had brought, he said, "I have food that ye know not of." When his disciples looked at one another and at him wonderingly, not taking his thought, he explained himself: "My food is to do the will of Him who sent me and finish his work." This was what he had just been doing, — awakening the woman's attention, declaring a great truth, and in the very act so refreshing and deepening his own sense of it, that he was insensible to the bodily wants which a little while before were so pressing. And how great the change in him was, how he became at once all animation, refreshed, exhilarated, appears from what followed. Suddenly he descried a crowd of people in the distance, coming running towards the well, using great haste, fearing perhaps lest the wonderful stranger whom the woman had told them of should be gone, and he exclaimed at the sight, "Say not ye, There are yet four months and then cometh the harvest? Behold! I say unto you, Lift up your eyes! Look on the fields! — they are white already to the harvest!" Cheered by the sense of the truth, the power of which he was conscious of in himself and saw visibly before him in the people that were approaching,

he feels as if all difficulty were at an end, — that now the full, rich harvest was to be gathered in. And here too we have another instance of the intuitive manner in which he saw in outward things illustrations of what was passing within him. Springtime and harvest were symbols of the operations of the spirit of truth. The natural harvest represented to him the results of truth. Is it not always so? Whenever a man has had any great object at heart, has not everything seemed as if it happened only to express it? Thus was it with Jesus. For the moment so transported was he with a sense of the truth that he loved supremely, that all the difficulties, all the suffering and persecution still awaiting him and his disciples before the harvest-time could come, vanished away.

I do not however perceive the precise point of all that Jesus is recorded to have said on this occasion, and Dr. Schenkel throws no light upon it. So far as I am able to understand them most of the utterances ascribed to him are full of point and power. And here I conceive is the reason why so many of his sayings have been remembered and perpetuated. Nobody thought of providing for their preservation at the time. He himself never wrote a word, or directed a word to be written. And therefore, brief and imperfect as are the records that have come down to us, the wonder is that so many of his acts and sayings have been remembered. But the wonder ceases when we consider what these things are that are told of him, how full of significance, how great. Even though but partially understood at the time, what with his tones, his looks, his whole manner, which, considering the commanding air that the extraordinary strength of his convictions gave him, must have been most impressive, his words burnt themselves into the minds of those who heard him. They could not be forgotten. They were as sure to be recorded and handed down from age to age as to be told at the moment by word of mouth. "Do great deeds and they will sing themselves." This saying finds in the history of Jesus its fullest illustration. The question which these able German scholars are expending whole libraries upon, namely, whence came the Gospels, cannot be of the first importance. As I have said already, the Gospels wrote themselves. They had to be. The memory of him, whose personal greatness is the special miracle of all time, the world could not let die. You must abrogate the laws of human nature first, and change the constitution of the world.

The sayings of Jesus being thus uniformly great, I do not, I repeat, perceive the force of all that he is reported to have said to his disciples under the inspiring effect of this occasion. There is a force here as there is doubtless in many another passage of the history which has not yet been discerned. Among other things he said: "I sent you to reap that whereon ye bestowed no labor: others labored and ye are entered into their labors;" i. e. I suppose, "As I sent you just now to procure food which you had spent no labor in producing, so now the triumph of truth, the harvest, is so near at hand, you have only to go into the field and enjoy the fruits of the labors of those who have toiled before you." So it seemed to Jesus. All the future lay bright before him in the light of a faith so exalted at the moment that the final success was alone present to him.

And is not this profoundly natural, thoroughly human? How could he give utterance to such great things and remain himself unmoved? He did not speak by rote. Who ever felt as he did the power of the truth to which he gave such simple and clear expression? It kindled his imagination. It set him all in a glow. And thus he grew and overflowed with the life of God.

He was no exception to the universal law. Great as was the work he did, the greatest result by far of the truth which he served with devotion unequalled is to be found in himself. The truth always does infinitely more for those who serve it faithfully than they do or can do for the truth. Never can any human being put the great Cause under obligations to him personally. However hard he toils for it, however much he suffers for it, though he dies ten thousand deaths for it, still he dies its debtor.

Jesus served the truth as no other ever has done, and it has bound his brows with its brightest crown and put in his hand the sceptre of universal empire. So filled was he with its power, he became the likeness and representative of the Highest. His face shines now forever with "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God," and mankind recognize in him, as in no other who has ever lived, the divinest beauty that they know. His Apostles after him toiled and suffered in a like spirit, and consequently they counted it all joy to endure trials. They gloried in the tribulations through which came new and inspiring experiences of the power of truth to sustain and invigorate them. They thrilled under the energy of God pouring into every nerve and vein. Their light afflictions — so they termed their soul-

searching trials — they accounted as not worth mentioning in comparison with "the eternal weight of glory" that was revealed.

Thus the imperishable good which Jesus has done for mankind consists in his being simply what he was. And we receive the best influences of Christianity as we become personally acquainted with him. Thus it was that his immediate friends were regenerated by him, as we have seen. (See note *b.* to ch. xiii.)

There is an incident in the history of Jesus, commented upon in the fourth and final division of the foregoing chapter (see p. 282), which although entirely different in its particulars from that which took place at the well of Jacob, is kindred to it in the illustration which it gives us of the character of Jesus. I refer to the visit of Jesus to Martha and Mary in Bethany (Luke x. 38 – 42). The distinctive characters of these two sisters are very strikingly indicated in the one or two very brief notices that we have of them, although Dr. Schenkel appears to see little difference in them except that Mary, probably the younger, understood Jesus best. This difference it is evident was due to the difference of their natures. Martha was active, Mary contemplative. Martha had little or no sensibility, Mary had much. Being of a busy, matter-of-fact temperament, when Jesus came to visit them, Martha instantly set to work to discharge the offices of a bountiful hospitality. Her first and best thought was to provide a special entertainment for their revered guest. She could think of no other way of doing him honor. Her sister, with her deeper sensibility and greater appreciation of Jesus, forgot everything else in listening to him. She cared little for eating and drinking; and so she planted herself, a model of attention, at his feet, to catch those gracious words of his, the music of his tones. Whereupon Martha, feverishly anxious I suppose to do her best for him was vexed, and perhaps a little jealous of her sister. Accordingly she complained to Jesus that Mary was giving her no assistance, — leaving her to do everything. To her complaints Jesus answered, not in a warning but in an expostulatory tone: "Martha, Martha, thou art anxious and troubled about many things. But one thing is needful: and Mary hath chosen that good part that shall not be taken from her." Now while it is unquestionably true that for the most part we fail to fathom the full significance of the utterances of Jesus, yet sometimes we imagine a deeper meaning in his words than he intended. At

least it is so, I apprehend, in this instance. He is commonly understood as giving Martha an admonition, as intimating in his answer to her complaint of her sister that she, Martha, was worldly, too much absorbed in earthly things, — that there is but one thing needful, the salvation of the soul, and that Mary was seeking that and she should have what she had chosen. Our author says that "in the significant word, 'One thing is needful,' Jesus points away from a busy and useless spirit to that in the human heart which alone endures and satisfies, the free, childlike mind," &c. He may have intended some allusion of this sort by the one thing needful, but the words do not require it, and it is wholly unnecessary to suppose that Jesus intended to cast any slur upon Martha. He understood her, I doubt not, and he saw that she was doing her best in her own way to testify her high regard for him. There is nothing in his language that requires us to believe that he meant anything more than if he had said (not at all in a warning or monitory tone, but with the gentle accent of expostulation): "Martha, Martha, you are troubling yourself to provide a great many things for us, we need only one. Mary has chosen the best part of the entertainment, — to sit and listen and converse, — this is the real refreshment which she prefers, and she shall not be deprived of it." Thus on this occasion, as at the well of Jacob, the spiritual took instant precedence, in his regard, of the physical, the mind of the body. Hungry and thirsty though he might be, nothing so animated him as the exercise and communion of the spirit. It was more refreshing than water from the well at the sultry noontide, more exhilarating than wine at the hospitable table of a friend. — TRANS.]

CHAPTER XVII.

THE TRUE MEANS OF VIRTUE.

1. That Jesus, after his final journey through Samaria, tarried some time in Judea, is even intimated by the first two Evangelists.[1] They relate that in Judea as in Galilee he awakened a lively interest among the people, and that he taught them and healed the sick.[2] Such a state of things could have existed only in consequence of his having sojourned among them for some length of time. An ordinary journey on the occasion of a national festival would have led Jesus directly to the central scene of the festival, the city of Jerusalem. But he seems for a time not to have entered the capital, but to have gone first only to Bethany, there in the abode of the two sisters to have found a retreat, and thence to have made excursions into the surrounding country of Judea and to the shores of the Jordan. During the last weeks preceding the decisive hour which was at hand, he gave particular attention to the work of preparing his disciples for it, seeking to enlarge and confirm their knowledge of the nature of the Divine kingdom, and to strengthen their faith still weak at heart. He held it to be one of his chief tasks at this time to make as plain as possible to them the wide difference between his teaching and the theology of the Jewish schools.

The error of the Jewish theology or of Pharisaism showed its ruinous effects in no respect more strikingly than in regard to the doctrine of the Means of Virtue.

[1] Mark x. 1; Matt. xix. 1. [2] Matt. xix. 2.

The first importance was attached to a pedantic precision in the observance of the law, to a punctilious practice of the written duties of religion. Prayers, fastings, almsgivings, washings, offerings, all observed according to the letter of the ordinances, constituted the way to a life of perfect virtue. Hitherto Jesus had not given his disciples any special directions as to the use of the means of virtue. He had prayed with them when need was, out of a full heart, not according to any prescribed method. Regular fasts, he had appointed none. And he had given to the poor according to his ability, when occasion required and the heart prompted. But now, as the day drew near that was to separate him from his disciples, as they were shortly to be wholly deprived of his guidance, he felt the necessity of instructing them particularly on these points, and of warning them against the Pharisaical appearance of piety and mask of virtue by which the inexperienced are so easily deceived.

2. The disciples themselves appear to have sought such instructions. They desired from the lips of their Master a short prayer, prepared for their use, and containing all that they were daily to pray for. Not as a fixed form of prayer, or as the only proper form, not even as a so-called pattern, but only as showing how and for what a true disciple should pray, Jesus gave them the "Lord's Prayer," the prayer of prayers. As it was not designed to be a fixed formula it early underwent a change of form as it circulated in the Christian Communion. In its original shape, as preserved by Luke from the record used by him in his account of the final sojourn of Jesus in Judea, the Lord's Prayer read thus: "Father, may thy name be reverenced. May thy kingdom come. Give us each

day our needful food. And forgive our sins, for we forgive every one who wrongs us. And bring us not into trial."[1] Strictly taken, there are four prayers in which Jesus comprises all that is worthy of being prayed for: two prayers for the furtherance of the eternal and supreme good within us, and two prayers for the things that concern our moral and physical well-being. The first prayer rests upon the faith that all salvation is from God and can be secured only as His name is sacred in our minds; the second upon the hope that the kingdom of God is to be realized on earth, but that above all things it must be built up in the sanctuary of our own hearts. Jesus thus teaches his disciples to pray for the very opposite of that which constituted the object to which the desires and prayers of the Pharisees were directed. The magnifying of the Divine name in the sacrificial ceremonial of the Temple and by the lips of subjugated nations, — the realization of God's kingdom by military conquest and the oppression of heathen lands, — this was what they thought of in their prayers. The last two petitions have reference to our natural subsistence and our well-being. If man is to devote his strength to the supreme good with joy and with success, he needs bodily support from day to day; freedom from the most urgent cares for his physical well-being. He needs especially a good conscience towards God and his neighbor, the forgiving love of his Heavenly Father reflected in his own forgiving disposition towards his neighbor. Finally, he needs also to feel assured that God will not lay upon him greater tasks than he can perform. The conclusion, that we may not be led into temptation, has a special significance in

[1] Luke xi. 1 – 4; comp. Matt. vi. 9.

connection with the near sufferings and death of Jesus, and the strong temptation to apostasy into which his disciples would be led in consequence.[1] Thus Jesus shows his disciples in this prayer what they should pray for. The earthly penetrated with the heavenly, the physical life with the life of the spirit from above, — this should forever be their daily and most fervent supplication to God.

But Jesus at the same time gave instructions as to the manner and way in which prayer should be offered. They have been preserved for us by the first Evangelist from the Collection of Sayings, although not in their original connection.[2] Every prayer is to be offered above all things sincerely, without pretence or delusion. It may well strike one as remarkable that Jesus here warns his disciples against prayer in public, against the prayers of public worship. He who knew the heart so wonderfully knew its weakness and vanity, — knew its proneness to put on a mask before others. He warned his disciples therefore against the prayers of the synagogue and the street, because one who prays there gives it to be supposed that he seeks to display emotions which perhaps have no existence in his heart. But while Jesus sends men to the "closet" to pray, he does not by any means forbid social prayer. When he taught in the synagogue he doubtless repeated the customary prayers of the place, or prayed from the fulness of his heart. Still he holds it his duty to point to the dangers of those public places, so open to display. He lifts his warning voice against all attempts to promote communion with God and life in God by show and pomp in public worship, by costly church services. He sends men to pray in the still-

[1] See App., Ill. 20, p. 96. [2] Matt. vi. 5.

ness of solitude. Prayer will be most sincere when there is no witness but the All-seeing. It is not the prayer, but only its result, the answer, that is to be public.[1]

In the second place, every prayer is to be simple and concise. The religion of forms would win an answer from God by a lavish use of words, by *laboring* in prayer. It thus imitates the folly of the heathen. Ringing changes of words, it treats God as an ignorant idol. The Omniscient and All-wise Father in heaven knows our true need before we utter it, and what we call the hearing of prayer is therefore only the accord of the Divine will with human needs, so far as these are justified before God.

This last consideration might seem indeed to make prayer appear unnecessary and useless, as, without it, God of his wisdom and goodness will give to every one what he needs. Jesus therefore teaches, in the third place, that we are to pray earnestly. This quality of true prayer he has particularly illustrated by a parable of a man, who, upon the arrival of a hungry guest at midnight, allows the friend, to whom he resorts to help him in the emergency, no rest till he supplies him with what he requires.[2] This precept does not contradict the preceding one, for the earnest prayer is only heard when it is in unison with the Divine will, when not a stone, but nourishing bread is asked for, not a serpent but an edible fish, not a scorpion but an egg, not things poisonous but things worthy, precious, heavenly, in a word, the Holy Spirit.[3] The true use of prayer thus lies in the moral and spiritual elevation of the worshipper. The granting of the prayer, as an external fact, has in itself no worth; it becomes real

[1] Matt. vi. 6. [2] Luke xi. 5. [3] Luke xi. 9; Matt. vii. 7.

only as an inward personal experience, as a means of strength and animation supplied by faith.

With the description which he thus gave of true prayer, as an act sincere, simple, concise and earnest, Jesus took a position in direct opposition to the prescriptive methods of prayer used by the Pharisees, who prayed in obedience to custom, with an abundance of words and phrases, and cold and heedless hearts.

3. As a further means of virtue, Jesus at the same time commended to his disciples the true fasting. The instructions which he gave on this head are not found in Luke's Gospel, and they could not possibly have been given by Jesus in the connection in which they appear in the first Gospel,[1] for, during his career in Galilee, Jesus proposed no fastings among his immediate disciples, — such ordinances were reserved for later and evil times.[2] Now, in Judea, the evil days had come; the days were now numbered during which Jesus was to be with those whom he loved. They must not now be wanting in the serious feeling befitting the solemnity of the situation. Jesus had now to teach them in what spirit he desired them to fast.

And here also his instructions are aimed at the Pharisaic ordinances. In the matter of fasting, the piety of the Pharisees was distinguished by externality, uncleanliness, and the affectation of sanctity. They fasted regularly and often, certain days of the week (Mondays and Thursdays). On these occasions they strewed ashes on their heads, washed neither face nor beard, dressed themselves in filthy mourning garments, omitting nothing that would give them the appearance, in the eyes of men, of being pious worshippers of God. This morose and repulsive custom, which was used

[1] Matt. vi. 16. [2] Mark ii. 18; Matt. ix. 14; Luke v. 33.

only to deceive, was an abomination to Jesus. His pure mind revolted with indignation at fasting imposed by authority, observed only in compliance with fashion and law, and regarded as highly meritorious.[1] He transferred fasting from without to the heart within. Whosoever fasts, he teaches, is to appear like one who arrays himself for a feast. No one was to have any suspicion of the mourning in his heart. Real pain, true mourning, according to the idea of Jesus, hides itself from human eyes. It withdraws into the sanctuary of the conscience. The mourning which shows itself is the boasting vanity of a child, seeking to appear and to represent itself as it is not. But how instructive the fact that Jesus forbids even the outward signs of mourning! Abstinence and self-mortification, the renunciation of even lawful enjoyments, the restraint and denial of sensual impulses and necessities, may at times become indispensable duties. But duty of this kind is to be discharged, not by command and prescription, but in deference purely voluntary to an inner law, a moral necessity. It is not only a duty of conscience, but a privilege, a right. No other authority is here to interfere, no other will to decide. So only can self-mortification have a salutary and effective influence, and restore again the disturbed moral equilibrium. That Jesus thus condemned fasting publicly prescribed, is beyond all question.

It was in connection with these injunctions probably, that Jesus spoke of the inner light, of that spiritual soundness, without which man is lying in darkness and sin.[2] This inner light is native to the unsophisticated conscience of every human being; but the artificial, spurious piety which aims only at appearance blinds the

[1] Matt. vi. 19. [2] Luke xi. 33; Matt. vi. 22.

spiritual vision. Hypocrisy weakens the conscience, and with the conscience the inborn sense of God, and the natural love of God. In this way the light becomes darkness, and the darkness appears to men as light. The formal piety of the lips, seeming virtue to the weak, is in truth the very opposite. The conflict with hypocrisy, which the weak pronounce impious, is in reality virtue.

4. The third means of virtue, which Jesus at that same time enjoined upon his disciples, was the practice of doing good to others, and especially the right use of worldly goods. A particular occasion appears to have prompted Jesus to utter an emphatic admonition on this point. Shortly after his arrival in Judea, a wealthy Jew, who, without any immediate acquaintance with him, had, from what he had heard, conceived great respect for him, asked Jesus to use his authority and decide a question that had risen between this person and his brother in relation to their inheritance. The request was made in good faith, but it was made under a grave misapprehension, and was a new instance going to show how difficult it was for good men even to form just ideas of Jesus. Jesus first of all availed himself of this opportunity to declare explicitly, that such matters were altogether foreign to his Messianic office; but with his declaration, he set forth his views of the position of the members of the Divine kingdom in relation to external goods. The elucidation is the more interesting because we learn from it his ideas of property and of the value of temporal possessions.

It is not true that Jesus condemned wealth in and for itself. What he condemned with emphasis is trust in riches, and the greed of having and gaining, which esteems property the highest end of life. He warns

his disciples, therefore, not against riches but against avarice,[1] or, as the first Evangelist has it, against the idolatry of gold, which is irreconcilable with the service of the living God.[2] By a striking parable Jesus shows the folly as well as the unworthiness of the worship of Mammon.[3] However much a man may with infinite pains amass, he has no security in its enjoyment; at any moment his life may be required of him by God, the Lord of life and death. The wise man therefore will accumulate treasure towards God, i. e. imperishable wealth for life eternal.[4] The right use of earthly possessions depends upon a right state of the heart and conscience towards God. The heart must be given to God without reserve; it will then regard earthly goods simply as means, valuable and of use only in subserving the highest.

It was at this time, probably during the last abode of Jesus in Judea, that the parable of the unjust steward was uttered. It is not so obscure as is generally supposed; the difficulty of understanding it has been greatly increased by the ingenuity of the commentators. It is in truth nothing more than an injunction to the right use of earthly goods. It was given at a time when the disciples were about to encounter the severest persecution, and when their labors for the kingdom of God would be wholly ineffectual, if their reliance were on temporal possessions. All the more urgent therefore the duty of Jesus, precisely at such a moment to instruct them in the right use of money and property. He took it for granted that until they were received into the Communion of the Divine kingdom, they had been serving "unrighteous" Mammon,

[1] Luke xii. 15.
[2] Matt. vi. 24; see also Luke xvi. 13.
[3] Luke xii. 16.
[4] Matt. vi. 19; Luke xii. 21.

i. e. property obtained more or less by means suggested by the selfish desire of gain. To get and to have for the sake of present enjoyment had been the main aim of their labors. But upon their entrance into the Communion of Jesus, their position towards earthly possessions was changed; it must become entirely new, especially now when the final crisis was at hand. They were now to renounce the service of Mammon altogether. They must treat Mammon as the steward treated the rich man.[1] The rich man in the parable is thus not God but Mammon. The steward is he who serves Mammon. To be unfaithful to Mammon is not wrong, but a duty. Jesus required his disciples thenceforth to spend temporal goods no longer in a worldly interest, but solely in the service of God and his kingdom. They were to be used for selfish purposes no more, but only as a means to the attainment of a higher good. Hence the disciples must always be ready to resign them for the sake of God. They must make up their minds to bear privation and use property in the same behalf. Accordingly, the declaration that no man can serve two masters, God and Mammon, finds its fitting place, as in Luke, only at the conclusion of this parable. Whosoever desires to keep faith with Mammon, cannot be true to God, and he who would be true to God must break faith with Mammon. No relations of fidelity can exist between the disciple of Jesus and Mammon. If before entering the kingdom of God the disciple had been a faithful steward of Mammon, he was now to become unfaithful. He must abstract money and goods from the use of earthly interests, and therewith win admission to the "everlasting mansions." Withdraw your property

[1] Luke xvi. 1.

from the concerns of this world to which in themselves they belong, and expend them in advancing and spreading the kingdom of God. Such is the lesson of the parable of the unjust steward.

The example of a man who esteems worldly fortune the highest end of life, Jesus presents to his disciples in the parable of the rich and the poor man.[1] The rich man represents orthodox Pharisaism lusting for riches, for the zeal for sound doctrine is entirely in keeping with the desire for gold and gain.[2] The poor man is the representative of the people, despised and neglected by the Pharisees. The rich man is rejected by God, not for his wealth, but for what his wealth has made him, its slave, with no heart for his suffering brother. The poor man is received by God, not on account of his poverty, but because he has borne it patiently, and, resigned to his lot, has been satisfied with the humblest means of subsistence. Bringing together the precepts of Jesus in regard to the use of material good, we gather from them the following rules: 1. The possession and enjoyment of earthly good must never be the aim of life with the disciples of Jesus. 2. The highest endeavors of a disciple should always be directed to the acquisition and possession of heavenly treasures, truth, righteousness, freedom and love, and to the consummation of the Divine kingdom, holiness and life eternal. 3. Earthly goods must be spent in the service of God and his kingdom, as the means of realizing the highest good on earth. 4. When the possession and acquisition of the supreme good are threatened, then for their sakes all perishable treasures are to be sacrificed with joy.

5. With the third direction of Jesus, in regard to

[1] Luke xvi. 19. [2] Luke xvi. 14.

the right use of earthly possessions, there is of necessity connected still a fourth, relating to care and anxiety for the future. This likewise has direct reference to the points on which the hierarchical party were prepared to aim their blows at Jesus. During his abode in Galilee the disciples had pursued their ordinary avocations, although with interruptions. They had remained with their families, and they were able to give the needful attention to the usual means of subsistence. Upon their missionary journeys they had become in some degree accustomed to leave their household concerns to others of their kin. But now that the scene of action was transferred to Judea, their position was wholly changed. In Judea they were wholly dependent upon the kindness and hospitality of those who were well disposed towards Jesus. And what was now to become of them when their Master should be executed as a criminal, and they themselves be condemned to ignominious punishments as violators of all laws, human and divine, — when their associates and friends in the faith should be overawed by threats, — when, hunted by the fury of their persecutors, they should be fugitives, or in prison, in exile, or want? This condition of things, soon to be realized, Jesus had in view in these instructions: "Take no thought for your life," &c.[1] It is not the recklessness of the heedless and slothful, but the freedom from anxious care of the God-trusting and truly pious, that Jesus here depicts with inimitable force and beauty. He might have adduced examples from the Old Testament; he might have referred to the signs and wonders of Divine Omnipotence. As he does not appeal to his own miracles, or to the gifts and powers possessed by his

[1] Luke xii. 22.

disciples, it is certainly a significant indication how little worth he attached to such extraordinary manifestations of Divine Providence. He pointed his disciples to the divine order of nature, to the lower creatures, to the raven, to the rapacious animals that, in spite of their worthlessness, God feeds; to the lily, the briefly blooming wild flowers which, perishable as they are, God adorns with a glory surpassing the royal magnificence of Solomon. Since God has ordered the kingdom of nature thus wisely, how can he forget those who are fulfilling his eternal will in the kingdom of his truth and love! Let every one strive vigorously for the greatest, and the least will not be wanting to him.[1] Such is the faith-inspired rule of life which Jesus gives his disciples as they approach the threshold of the most anxious and fearful period of their lives. He did not of course forbid painstaking and care in and of themselves. Cares will come of necessity. It is only the tormenting care, which springs from a want of trust in God, from senseless despair of the wisdom and love in the divine order of the world, upon which the condemning sentence of Jesus is passed. The fourth means of virtue which Jesus commends to his disciples is, therefore, in all the troubles of life to put a steadfast, unwavering reliance in the wisdom and love ruling over the world and controlling all human things. To cherish this reliance is the special privilege of the members of his kingdom.

[1] Matt. vi. 25.

NOTE.

[The title of this chapter, "the true means of virtue," conveys the impression that Jesus proposed or instituted certain methods or forms, valuable only as means, by the use of which personal goodness is to be secured. Whereas it appears to me he recognized no means of virtue but virtue. What our author specifies and enumerates as the means which Jesus recommends to this end, what are they but the true laws and conditions of all spiritual well-being? the very graces which it is the end of Christianity to create, the manifestations of the spirit of Jesus himself and of God? What Jesus says of prayer, for example, is simply what is written in human nature. He appoints neither times nor places, nor does he prescribe any external form. His language is, "Ask and you will receive," because in the very constitution of things, the desire for spiritual good must precede the reception of it. In order to be good we must want to be good. The want, the longing is the substance of prayer; and the supply comes through and in the want. Seek and you will find, knock and the gates of life will fly open. These are figures of speech. But "ask and you will receive" is no less a figure of speech. Under these various forms is stated a fact in nature. As for fasting, does not Jesus virtually abolish it as an external observance when he discountenances all outward manifestations of it? He enjoins no practices of this kind. In fact, the teachings of Jesus in regard to the points mentioned in this chapter are all at once so natural and so universal, they so directly concern all men, that one cannot but feel that Jesus addressed them mainly to men as men. It narrows their grand scope to represent him, as our author represents him, as giving them as specific instructions to be observed for a particular end. What I wish to say is, that arranging and systematizing the teachings of Jesus in this way tends to create a false impression, namely, that they were originally uttered by him systematically, so to speak, and for a precise purpose. Unquestionably he was most interested in teaching those who were the most interested in his teachings, — his disciples. And doubtless his manner of stating truth was modified and colored in a degree with reference to their position and the demands of the time. But after all it was in the depth and universality of the truth to which he gave utterance that his

personal convictions were rooted, and he poured them forth rather out of the fulness of a heart sympathizing with all humanity than from a view to any definite end. Thus was it with the parable of the rich man, told in Luke (ch. xii. 13 – 26), which was purely occasional, suggested by the application made to Jesus to settle a dispute concerning an inheritance, and which Dr. Schenkel treats as if it were related for the special purpose of instructing the disciples in their apostolic duty in regard to worldly goods. While our author thus represents Jesus as carrying out a plan, and creates a certain impression of limitation and narrowness, he gives the disciples, I think, more credit than is their due for insight into the true, spiritual, suffering destiny of Jesus. That they were daily becoming more and more strengthened in their faith that he was the Messiah there can be no doubt. But the more they were confirmed in this faith the less were they disposed to believe in his sufferings, and the more confident were their expectations of the riches and honors to be gained through him. — Trans.]

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE CALLING OF THE GENTILES.

1. At the same time that Jesus availed himself of his final sojourn in Judea to prepare his disciples for the appalling events that were at hand, he made a last attempt to deliver his unhappy countrymen from theological despotism and the supremacy of the priesthood. His conviction had grown deeper and deeper that there was no salvation for Israel, moral or national, in the way that had now been trodden for centuries. The hope cherished by the hierarchical party of a speedy elevation of Israel over its political opponents was an idle dream, from which, when the nation should be seriously dealt with, there would be a fearful awakening. Deliverance could come only from within out-

wardly; not by the weapons of the flesh, insurrection and war, but by the weapons of the spirit, by a moral and religious renovation of the collective life of the people upon the groundwork of truth and righteousness, love and peace, moderation and tolerance. Even Rome itself, in the pride of its might and wickedness, could be humbled and conquered by these weapons. A deep unrest pervaded the population, especially of Judea. The fires of revolt were glimmering under the ashes. Upon the occasion of a public religious solemnity, certain Galileans engaged in a riot had been mercilessly slaughtered at the command of the Roman Procurator, Pontius Pilate. Having arrived in the neighborhood of the scene of this massacre, Jesus eagerly seized the occasion to warn the people, excited to desperation, against such vain and fatal attempts. It was clear to him that the condition of the sin-burdened people was owing, not to the depravity of a few individuals here and there, deceived and deceivers, but rather to the depraved state into which they had all fallen, and especially to the blind leaders at their head. The people had heedlessly thrown themselves into the arms of the hierarchical party. Jesus had in vain admonished and besought and warned them. They had for the most part turned their backs upon him, irritated and restless. Since he had declared it to be his Messianic destiny to sacrifice himself, to suffer and die, the larger portion of them had gone over to his opposers. Under such circumstances he could not conceal from himself that Israel had become incapable of fulfilling the divine plan of salvation; that the nation could not regenerate the world in the spirit of divine truth and freedom; that precisely the reverse of what the old prophets foretold of it would in reality befall. Ac-

cording to those predictions, Israel, as the people of peoples, was to gather into itself and elevate all nations. But the course of events was taking such a direction that, as a nation, Israel must inevitably suffer internal dissolution. This fate Jesus directly announced in a solemn parable. He compared the nation to a fig-tree in a fruitful vineyard. The vineyard is the symbol of the world. Instead of benefiting the nations the fig-tree drew its strength from them. It was steadily declining into the condition of a parasite upon the civil and national life of the populations of that period. For years it had produced no good fruit. A last reprieve had been granted it by God. And as this also had passed away the vineyard must be planted anew, the fig-tree be consigned to destruction.[1]

This parable of the fig-tree was in all probability uttered by Jesus before his last entrance into the city of Jerusalem, at a time when he had not yet given up the hope that a portion at least of the people might be saved from the fate of their leaders. The later tradition has lost sight of the particular occasion of the parable, and converted it into an external occurrence,[2] whereby the whole thing is rendered unintelligible. How could Jesus have seriously looked for fruit on a fig-tree at a season of the year when, in the nature of the case, it could not bear any fruit?[3] How could he have seriously cursed, — given over to destruction, a tree that really was not unfruitful, or at all events could not be responsible for its unfruitfulness? How, in fine, can we in any way imagine and describe the action of the supernatural power of Jesus upon a tree? These insuperable difficulties all vanish when we sup-

[1] Luke xiii. 6–9.
[2] Mark xi. 12; Matt. xxi. 18.
[3] Mark xi. 13.

pose that the doom that threatened Israel, and which was originally pronounced by Jesus in the form of a parable, came to be represented as if it had been immediately executed upon a fig-tree, by the later tradition running naturally into legendary exaggerations and miraculous embellishments. We may easily trace the growth of the legend out of the parable. While according to the older reporter, the second Evangelist, the destructive effect of the curse was not visible until the next day,[1] according to the later reporter, on the other hand, the first Evangelist, the effect of the curse was made instantly apparent to the disciples.[2] (*a*)

2. But as now with every hour all hope was fading away that the revolution that was to accomplish the moral and religious renovation of the world would proceed from Israel as the people chosen of God, all the more confidently were the eyes of Jesus turned to heathen nations as the future fields of the kingdom of God, as the centres whence the new Messianic ideas were to radiate. It appears that at this time there were in the immediate neighborhood of Jesus himself, some persons, individual Israelites, upon whom light had dawned, and who had apprehensions of the inevitable downfall of Israel. The inquirer in the third Gospel[3] does not conceal from himself that the number of Jews who will be converted will be proportionally small, and Jesus tells him that although many Jews desire to be admitted into the kingdom of God, admission will be granted only to a few, as a few only were able to form a right judgment of the nature and character of the Divine kingdom. It was then probably that Jesus gave the warning which the first Evan-

[1] Matt. xi. 20. Consult Appendix, III. 21, p. 110.
[2] Matt. xxi. 19.
[3] Luke xiii. 23.

gelist has woven into the Sermon on the Mount, namely, that the narrow gate leads to the eternal life.[1] The way of the Pharisees and Scribes was broad. By a punctilious observance of church ordinances the kingdom of heaven was opened to them; a thorough moral and religious renovation was not required. The great body of the Jews sought to reach the heavenly kingdom by this convenient way. On this account Jesus now broadly declares what, during his journey at an earlier period to Phœnicia, and even upon the occasion of sending forth his disciples over a larger extent of country, he had only hinted at, — that the calling of the Gentiles into the kingdom of God was his commission, and that the Gentiles were indeed to be preferred before the Jews.[2] (*b*)

Hence we also see now why during his last abode in Judea Jesus regarded it as one of his chief tasks to break down the prejudice that Israel alone was called to the kingdom of God. He would not have truly fulfilled his commission had he not left upon earth the idea that he was the Saviour of all nations, and that all mankind have an interest in his Communion. He had not so declared himself in Galilee. At the gates of the City of the Temple the truth must be proclaimed. In the presence of the hierarchical party he must dissipate the delusion that the circumcised Jew alone can find favor with God.

Bitterly as he was opposed by the hierarchical party, an open and complete rupture with them had not yet taken place. For once, since he had come into the vicinity of the seat of their power, it suited their pur-

[1] Matt. vii. 13; Luke xiii. 24.

[2] Luke xiii. 29. Matthew assigns to this declaration too early a period (viii. 11).

pose to endeavor, if possible, to lull him into a feeling of security, so that when all should be prepared for the last blow, it might fall upon him all the more surely and fatally. Spies and plotters surrounded him in Judea on all sides. They invited him to their houses in order to entrap him. They pretended sympathy with him that they might discover some weak point in him. They even treated him with a certain deference that he might be led to open his lips and his heart. Invitations were not wanting even from the Pharisees. In the freedom of the social board it was reckoned that he would give the reins to his tongue and be tempted to the utterance of bold and injurious reflection upon the civil and religious authorities. In his account of this period Luke has not always stated things in the right order of time. It is not, however, difficult to discover the original connection. At an entertainment given ostensibly in honor of Jesus by a leader of the party, Jesus could hardly have healed a man suffering with dropsy, or have uttered such offensive expressions as we find in the third Evangelist.[1] The healing of the man took place probably before the repast, and the remarks upon the ambitious efforts of the guests to secure the highest places at the table were made by Jesus, we may suppose, at the conclusion of the feast and to a small circle. He used the occasion, however, to express in the hearing of the Pharisees, by means of a parable, his conviction that the Gentiles were to be invited into the kingdom of God.[2] The admonition to invite, not friends, brothers, kindred, and neighbors on these festive occa-

[1] Luke xiv. 7–11.

[2] That only the parable was told during the repast, Luke himself intimates (xiv. 7).

sions, but the poor, the maimed, the lame and the blind, cannot possibly be understood to the letter. It cannot have been addressed merely to the host. Jesus doubtless had chiefly in mind the narrow-hearted spirit of caste and pride of position that marked the Pharisees. He was thinking of the entire want of kindly sympathy for the poor and perishing people peculiar to the hierarchs. It was, moreover, characteristic of orthodox Judaism to be exclusive and narrow. The Pharisaic Jew acknowledged as brothers only those connected with him by the tie of a common descent and religion. He looked upon the Gentiles as poor, maimed, lame and blind, — as the refuse of the human race, with whom he neither ate nor drank. To show a human loving heart to a Gentile was contrary to his religion. He had no assurance of future reward therefor; only for the love which he manifested for the Jew was a recompense to be made him.[1]

That Jesus at that feast proclaimed, to the confusion of intolerant Pharisaism, the calling of the Gentiles into the kingdom of God, appears also from the parable of the supper.[2] This parable is probably the original form of the parable of the marriage feast, found in the first Gospel.[3] In both there is the feast, a picture of the kingdom of heaven (in the first Gospel a marriage feast significant of the establishment of the New Covenant), in both there are invited by the servants (messengers of salvation) certain persons who refuse to accept the invitation, and urge all sorts of subterfuges to excuse themselves. In both is the anger of the Giver of the feast (God calling men) at these persons who refuse to attend it. In both parables is there the determination of the host to extend

[1] Luke xiv. 12. [2] Luke xiv. 15–24. [3] Matt. xxii. 1.

his invitations even to such as were not particularly entitled to be invited, the Gentiles. In addition to these details there is in the first Gospel an allusion to the persecution suffered by the Apostles,[1] to the destruction of Jerusalem,[2] to the intrusion of unworthy persons from among the Gentiles into the kingdom of God.[3] Every thing thus shows the parable in the first Gospel to be an amplification of what was said by Jesus (upon the occasion of the feast at the house of the Pharisee) in a simpler form, and without any reference to events which had not then happened.

3. This extension of the original boundaries of the kingdom of God founded by Jesus, taking in the Gentile world, was not merely a consequence of the obduracy of Israel. It was also the necessary fulfilment of the Divine plan of salvation. God does not prefer one peculiar people; humanity itself is called to salvation. Nothing that Jesus said offended the pride of the hierarchical party so deeply as his declaration that the Gentiles were invited to share equally with the Jews in the Divine kingdom. A handle was here found which might be used with success to destroy him. Doubtless the friendly disposition towards the Gentiles, so distinctly expressed by him at a public table, soon became the daily talk in all the Pharisaic circles. He lost no time however in defending himself against the violent charges of the hierarchical party. Such was the aim of a series of parables, the most striking and beautiful of which Luke has preserved. The lost sheep,[4] the lost piece of money,[5] the lost son,[6] are not types of the people of Israel misled

[1] Matt. xxii. 6. [2] Matt. xxii. 7. [3] Matt. xxii. 11.
[4] Luke xv. 4–7; Matt. xviii. 12–14. [5] Luke xv. 8–10.
[6] Luke xv. 11–32.

by their spiritual guides and morally lost. According to the connection in which these parables were told, they are symbols of the Gentile world despised and hated by the hierarchical party, and regarded by them as emphatically the world of sinners. In the parable of the lost son especially, the reference to the Gentiles is as clearly apparent in the idea that the lost son no longer belongs to the father's house, as it is manifest that this same proposition is not applicable to Jewish sinners or publicans whose position in the household of God was held to be assured in consequence of their circumcision. This same proposition also applies to the Gentiles, inasmuch as they received their inheritance from the hand of God before the theocracy was instituted, and had squandered it in a strange land, away from the father's house, away from the Temple and its sanctities, from the Law and its benefits, from the priesthood and its ordinances.[1] The Gentile is also strikingly indicated by the younger son, while Israel on the other hand accounted himself the first-born son of God.

The admission of the Gentiles into the kingdom of Jesus was now also a necessary consequence of the loving concern that Jesus felt for sinners, that portion of mankind who were morally degraded and perishing. He saw it to be one of his chief labors to excite and develop the slumbering moral powers and spiritual gifts of the middle and lower orders who had been deliberately and heartlessly neglected by the privileged classes. The theocratic Messiah was the hero of the polite world, the suffering Messiah the helper of the poor oppressed people. The parable of the Pharisee and Publican has here a pointed significance. The

[1] Luke xv. 13.

Pharisee is the representative of orthodox Judaism, looking down upon sinners, and of course upon Gentiles, with contempt. The Publican is the representative of the Gentile world of sinners, in which was stirring a conscious longing, obscure indeed, but humble and sincere, for moral regeneration. He, the Publican, offering his prayer within the precincts of the Temple, is no proof that Jesus intends to represent him as a Jew. He stands afar off. He ventures not into the forecourt of the Jews. He deems himself only a stranger in the house of God. But even if we consider the Publican a Jew, he is still the representative of all those whom the hierarchical party esteemed worthless and outcast. At all events the Publican gives up all the means prescribed by the Mosaic law, whereby the Divine favor is to be obtained, and puts his trust unreservedly in the Divine mercy, and God holds him justified or reconciled to Him, without requiring of him any external observance as an atonement.

The state of the conscience in the sight of God is not determined by external observances. This was reason enough why Jesus should offer salvation to the Gentiles also. No circumcision, no sacrifice, no ceremonial purification, no Sabbath solemnities, no fastings, but the condition of the heart, of the inner life, decides every man's relation to God. The inevitable downfall of haughty, orthodox Judaism, the certain elevation of the Gentile world, humble, penitent, and longing for salvation, were the chief themes of the preaching of Jesus during his last abode in Judea. The fact that he urged upon his hearers the same thoughts substantially in perpetually new shapes and applications shows how interested he was at that time in overcoming

immediately around him the hereditary prejudices of Jewish exclusiveness, and especially in making his disciples more and more intimate with the idea that the kingdom of God established by him and to be extended by them, must embrace all nations. But he combated not only in word but in deed the prevailing exclusive spirit. Passing through Jericho, he did not disdain to enter the house and partake of the hospitality of a chief publican, Zaccheus, who had shown an earnest desire to see him.[1] Zaccheus was most probably a Gentile. For this reason we are justified in supposing he was popularly denominated a sinner. But Jesus declared that he also was a son of Abraham,[2] a fact of which, if Zaccheus really were a Jew, the bystanders needed not to be told. During this period Jesus looked upon the Communion of the "faithful" as the true Israel, and consequently in every Gentile who received him into his house and heart he saw a true descendant of Abraham. The same key-note is heard again in the discourses of Jesus of the same period, preserved in the fourth Gospel. That he had still other sheep from another fold, that he must lead them likewise, that they hear his voice, that there will be one fold and one Shepherd,[3] Jesus declares with great distinctness. The desire of certain "Greeks" to see him, bringing vividly to his mind the longing of the Gentile world for salvation, seemed to him the beginning of the glorifying of his work on earth.[4] (*c*)

[1] Luke xix. 1 – 9.
[2] Luke xix. 9.
[3] John x. 16.
[4] John xii. 20.

NOTES.

[*a.* p. 110. It is not to be denied that the "cursing of the fig-tree" presents great difficulties. The explanation given above, namely, that the incident (Matt. xxi. 18; Mark xi. 12) is an exaggeration or legend growing out of the parable (Luke xiii. 6) is plausible, and would be satisfactory if it did not involve so extensive a fabrication of particulars as, being admitted in this instance, would leave but little of an historical character to the Gospels; particulars too, as truly worthy to be entitled "historical traits" as any which our author indicates elsewhere in these narratives, particulars, all the more striking for being found in connection with a legend so rudely composed, if it be a legend. I refer especially to the remarkable and characteristic utterances of Jesus in regard to faith and prayer, so naturally suggested by the withered tree. Although it is difficult to conceive how the will of Jesus should act upon the tree, yet we cannot presume to deny the possible existence of occult relations between mind and matter by which such action took place. If, as there are no slight grounds for believing, Jesus were possessed of an extraordinary energy of will that was native to him, then the sudden and passionate expression of it may have been attended by effects that perhaps he himself did not distinctly anticipate. The language which Jesus is related to have used in reference to the tree (differently reported by Matthew and Mark), does not strike us in itself as sufficiently forcible to be termed a *curse*. And yet so it was called by those who heard it. It must therefore have been the manner and tone of Jesus that gave it this appearance. That the tree was barren at the time is evident from the fact that it was not the season, as it is stated, for figs. Had it been the season it would have been a fair inference that the fruit being ripe had all been plucked. But here it is difficult to understand why, as it was not the right time for this fruit, Jesus should have expected to find ripe figs on the tree. This passage of the history is an embarrassing one. I am aware that the explanation of it at which I hint and which I have endeavored to set forth more fully elsewhere (*Thoughts on the Life and Character of Jesus of Nazareth*, p. 260), must task the credulity of the reader. I do not urge it with confidence. It looks to me however as if some effect must have been visible on this occasion of an unusual char-

acter, for Jesus himself was struck with the mighty force of faith, to judge from the way in which he expressed himself. When his attention was called to the condition of the fig-tree he said, — and mark the strength of his asseveration: "Have faith in God. For verily I say unto you, that whosoever shall say to this mountain, Be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea, and shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe that those things which he saith shall come to pass, he shall have whatsoever he saith." Supposing that the tree did really wither away under his curse, "is it not striking to think that although there was a power in him that could uproot mountains, he was yet so exalted above every thought of using it for his pride or passion, that only once, when he was disappointed at finding no fruit on a fig-tree, was he betrayed into a hasty and passionate exertion of his mighty will? He becomes even more wonderful for his forgetfulness of his power than for his exercise of it."

b. p. 111. Dr. Schenkel, I apprehend, puts modern ideas into the mind of the man mentioned in the third Gospel (Luke xiii. 23), who inquired of Jesus whether there were only a few to be saved. According to Jewish modes of thinking, salvation was synonymous with the coming of the Messiah and the establishment of his glorious Jewish empire. Consequently there is no reason to suppose that the individual who inquired of Jesus as to the number who were to be saved had any other thought in his mind than to ascertain, if he might, how many were to be admitted to a share in the wealth and honors of the coming kingdom of the Messiah. The Jews believed that admission to the kingdom required some personal qualifications therefor; that the righteous only, according to the traditional Jewish standard of righteousness, would be received. The way in which they flocked to the Baptism of John reveals this faith. It is very doubtful however whether the inquirer mentioned above had any idea of "conversion," or was of the number of those who had a presentiment of "the inevitable downfall of Israel."

I have been accustomed to understand the words of Jesus in the seventh chapter of Matthew, thirteenth and fourteenth verses, in a much more comprehensive sense than is given to them by our author. "Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be that go in thereat. Because strait is the gate and

narrow the way which leadeth to life, and few there be that find it." Is not this to be taken as a representation of human life at all times and everywhere? Was Jesus when he uttered these words thinking only of the "broad road of Pharisaism?" I think not.

Dr. Schenkel thinks that Matthew places at too early a period the declaration of Jesus, "that many were to come from the east and west, and sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven, &c." (ch. viii. 11.) (See note 2 on p. 111.) But is not the connection in which it is found in Matthew's Gospel strikingly natural? According to this Gospel, it was called forth by the confidence reposed in Jesus by a Gentile. This experience was unexpected to Jesus. He evidently was not prepared to find in a foreigner such a disposition to trust in him. He "marvelled" at it. But to his quick discerning insight there was more in the fact than lay on the surface. It was a revelation to him. It lifted a veil from before his eyes, and his vision was instantly extended beyond his own country. He perceived then more clearly than ever that truth and goodness have affinities with our universal nature.

c. p. 117. This chapter is colored throughout with the idea that Jesus constantly spoke with a view to certain proposed effects. That he had certain definite aims I do not presume to deny. It is by no means easy to draw any precise lines and to say when and wherein he was seeking to fulfil a particular purpose or plan. But certain it is that the indications of any organized movement in his history are neither numerous nor decisive. It is only by pressing various passages into the service of his theory, and by interpreting them in a manner more ingenious than satisfactory, that Dr. Schenkel succeeds in giving Jesus the appearance of aiming to carry out a defined scheme. It is the occasional, spontaneous, impulsive character of most of the sayings and acts attributed to Jesus that seems to me the predominant trait of his history. Not that he is deficient in consistency and method. But it is the profound consistency, the wonderful method, of nature that I see in him, and by his unconscious observance of which his thoughts breathe and his words burn. — TRANS.]

CHAPTER XIX.

FINAL INSTRUCTION OF THE DISCIPLES.

1. How much had yet to happen in order, in the few weeks which Jesus still had to spend with his disciples, to prepare them for the great work that awaited them of announcing and extending the kingdom of God throughout the world! Jesus had required of them extraordinary sacrifices. Worldly possessions and enjoyments they had surrendered without grudging. They had relinquished domestic joys and household comforts. They had put themselves, property and life, hand and heart, at the service of their Master and his Cause. After such sacrifices, they might justly demand that he should thoroughly instruct them concerning the final aim of his and their work. They knew what this work was in its general outlines. But now they needed to have it set before them, and fixed in their hearts in a series of particular instructions, and as clearly as possible. Jesus had founded a new Communion. To maintain what he had instituted, to cherish, protect, extend and enlarge it, the Apostles were first of all called. Numberless evils were to be met or avoided, immense difficulties put aside or overcome.

First of all, the young Association was exposed to the danger of disputes and divisions, caused by offence given within their own body; they were liable to fall apart through the want of due consideration. The disciples themselves were not yet morally and spiritually matured. Self-will, harshness, intolerance could

not fail to have the most serious effect upon the formation and progress of the new Communion. To obviate this danger, Jesus uttered the warning against the offence that might so easily be given to the "little ones," i. e. to the weak among them, by the stronger and the more passionate.[1] The scandal which in the coming time of conflict and need was most to be feared, was the example of a want of love among themselves. Jesus, therefore, required of his disciples with special emphasis a heart gentle and always open to explanation and forgiveness. The fault of the offender is not indeed to be wholly overlooked. Well-grounded reproof is a duty to our brothers and associates. But reproof should always be administered in the language of love, and not in the language of passion. And the party personally injured was always to be ready heartily to forgive the injurer, especially when he was sorry for his fault, and resolved to repair it, — yes, and he should forgive as often as he had opportunity; and the fault, though several times repeated, was to be no bar to a continued forgiving disposition. The exhortation to be always placable was not probably uttered precisely in the form in which it has been handed down by the first Evangelist,[2] as in this form it presupposes a more formal Association than then existed. The rule, however, that the final decision of disputes arising among the brotherhood should be referred to the members of the Communion collectively, is altogether in harmony with the spirit of Jesus. More difficult to understand is the declaration of Jesus, that everything which they, i. e. the Communion of the faithful (it is not the Apostles as such that are referred to, as the connection shows), should bind or loose on earth,

[1] Luke xvii. 2; Matt. xviii. 6. [2] Matt. xviii. 15.

should ordain as legal or cancel as illegal, was to be considered as ordained or as set aside in heaven, i. e. before God.[1] That the first Evangelist addresses this declaration to Peter alone, is a liberty that he has taken. This same word could not possibly have been spoken on both the occasions mentioned in the first Gospel, as the supreme authority of the Communion and the supreme authority of the Apostles reciprocally exclude each other. The authority to bind or loose, to command or forbid, is granted to the Communion of the believing. But this authority, apparently given without qualification, is limited by what immediately follows, namely, that whatever two of them shall unite in praying for, God will grant them, and that where two or three are gathered together in the name of Jesus, he too will be in the midst of them. The binding and loosing, the ordaining and forbidding, is accordingly not intended to be an arbitrary, absolute exercise of power. It has authority and force only when it is, not merely unanimous and fraternal, but in accord likewise with the will of God or in communion with the Holy Spirit.

Even the Apostles could exercise their office successfully only in the spirit of self-renouncing humility. Jesus solemnly warns them against self-exaltation in the parable of the Master and his Servant.[2] Even when they do the will of God without fault, they only do their duty; they have established no manner of claim to a reward. This parable also shows very strikingly that Jesus promised his disciples, even in the prospect of the greatest dangers and sacrifices, no other reward than that which is found in the faithful performance of duty itself.

[1] Matt. xviii. 18. [2] Luke xvii. 7 – 10.

2. But Jesus had to require of his disciples more than was demanded of them according to customary standards. The disturbed state of the times, the inevitable persecution awaiting them, the insecurity of their condition, their calling admitting of no rest, — all this, as we have already seen, had imposed upon them the necessity of breaking away from their domestic relations. The question whether an Apostle might marry, had become a question of conscience. Jesus held it, therefore, his duty to instruct his disciples particularly concerning the marriage relation, and their position in regard to it. A special occasion for instructing them in regard to the nature and worth of marriage had been afforded him, it appears, during his last abode in Judea, by the emissaries of the hierarchical party. It was probably upon his first visit to Jerusalem, that the Pharisees brought to him a woman taken in the act of adultery, and demanded of him his judgment in respect to her punishment. They hoped, doubtless, to involve him in a contradiction, either of the civil and ecclesiastical laws, which in this case pronounced the punishment to be death, or of his own humane principles.[1] They most hoped the former, for he had explicitly declared that he had come to save the lost.[2] Jesus, however, did not pronounce upon the case brought before him. He simply referred it to the consciences of his questioners. He demanded of them that whosoever among them knew himself in his own conscience to be pure from sin against chastity, should throw the first stone at the guilty woman.

The spies, touched by the voice of conscience, vanished, but only to lay a new snare for Jesus. He had

[1] John viii. 1–11. See Appendix, Ill. 22, p. 124.
[2] Matt. xviii. 11; Luke xix. 10.

certainly exposed himself now to the appearance of a lax dealing with the marriage tie. This appearance was made use of for crafty questions put to him on the subject of divorce. His opponents first inquired of him whether divorce were allowable.[1] They might hope that upon this occasion he would expose himself on one side or the other. For the theological schools of the time were divided among themselves in the interpretation of the passage of the law referring to this point. The law gave the husband the liberty in certain cases to repudiate his wife.[2] Jesus might, therefore, in entire harmony with the law, answer the question put to him (in the first Gospel), that divorces were not allowable "for all possible causes."[3] But his position became more difficult when (according to the second Evangelist)[4] he had to declare himself in regard to divorce in itself. And in all probability, in this case also the second Evangelist has given us the authentic account. As in the instance of the woman taken in adultery, Jesus did not speak out directly, but led his questioners to declare their sense of the meaning and significance of the Law in relation to the point. Only after they had deduced from the Law a general authority given to the husband to give his wife a bill of divorcement, did he declare with deep solemnity how little he esteemed a lax view of the marriage tie. He had treated a single case of an adulteress with tenderness and moderation. He was ever ready to forgive the sins of the penitent, but he spoke with sharpness and severity when it came to vindicating the inviolability and sacredness of the marriage relation against the frivolous sophistries of hypocrites.

[1] Mark x. 2; compare the later account of Matt. xix. 3.
[2] Deut. xxiv. 1. [3] Matt. xix. 3. [4] Mark x. 2.

The point of his answer, it must be confessed, strikes at the Mosaic law itself. Moses, as a man and as a statesman and lawgiver, had, with reference to the condition of his people and to a passing necessity, made a concession to the weakness of human nature. This, Jesus considers as not just to the true and eternal idea of marriage, to its divine origin and its essential sanctity.[1] According to his conviction, divorce is in itself contrary to the idea and end of marriage. The design of the Pharisees to entrap Jesus was in consequence of this rejoinder again frustrated. They had hoped to be able to fasten upon him the charge of loose moral principles, and now he had shown them, that in external strictness it was their law and they themselves that were chargeable with lax morality.

But here arises another question, whether Jesus in pronouncing this judgment upon divorce had also the design of making a positive monogamical regulation for his flock? It must not be overlooked that Jesus only aimed for once to hold up an ideal to be aspired after in opposition to the defective decisions of the Mosaic Law. That he did not seek to lay down any rules as to the law of marriage as a civil matter is self-evident. Nowhere or ever did he lay claim to a right to legislate in matters of state.[2] Neither did he expect to realize immediately in his Communion the ideal which he set up. In fact he does not condemn without qualification the latitude of the Mosaic Law in regard to divorce. He suggests a special reason in excuse of it, namely, the consideration which it shows for the hardness of heart of the Jews.[3] As it belongs to the original idea of man that he is upright, so likewise it be-

[1] Gen. i. 27.

[2] Luke xii. 13.

[3] Mark x. 5; Matt. xix. 8.

longs to the original idea of marriage that it is inviolable. But as little as man conducts himself in the actual relations of life as if he had continued pure from sin, so little is marriage to be treated, moral and social circumstances being considered, as if the hearts of the married were strangers to faults and passions.

In what he said of marriage and divorce Jesus unquestionably had a higher purpose than merely to stop the mouths of the malicious. It was his aim to establish a standard of morals and of life worthier of our nature than any mere system of prescribed rules. The Communion formed by him was to repose on the eternal basis of truth, right, freedom, honor, brotherly love. He must therefore make the highest moral demands upon his disciples, and the solemnity, depth, and comprehensiveness of his requirements must not be hidden from his opposers. To consecrate home and the family was one of his first objects, and it was a point of prime necessity to secure respect and a true position for woman. By the Mosaic law of divorce the wife was put at the caprice of her husband. By the moral principle laid down by him Jesus would restrain this caprice. He had no thought, however, of designing to encroach with his principle upon the civil law. He simply contended for it as a principle of the Divine kingdom, and not with a view to its application by force. Aiming only to create an independent conviction and free acknowledgment of the dignity of human nature especially in the wife, he hoped by the consecration of love finally to carry out his principle.

3. The Pharisaic conspirators, confounded, doubtless, and rendered furious, retreated, and the disciples grew thoughtful. The high moral tasks which Jesus set before them disturbed their consciences. In this

thoughtful frame they probably first went home with Jesus, as the second Evangelist states,[1] and not until then, in private, was the conversation which had been broken off with the Pharisees resumed. It was then that Jesus made the further declaration, which the first Evangelist has put into the Sermon on the Mount,[2] but which has justly been referred exclusively to the period of the last visit of Jesus to Judea.[3] Jesus pronounces every second marriage of either of the divorced parties adultery. That his declaration is given in its original form by the second Evangelist is shown by the fact that in the second Gospel no mention is made of the excepted case in which divorce for adultery and consequently the second marriage of the innocent party are permitted.[4] As, according to the idea of Jesus, marriage is in itself inviolable, then divorce is in itself never allowable, and the forming of a new conjugal connection by either of the divorced parties is formal adultery. Such is the inexorable consequence of the principle affirmed by Jesus. It is the later tradition, which, upon the ground of the impracticability of this consequence, so far qualified the principle as to declare adultery, and only on the part of the wife, a sufficient reason for divorce on the part of the husband.

But in so doing the first Evangelist has not only deprived the principle itself of its point, but has discharged the declaration of Jesus of its essential purport, namely, the liberation of the wife from the arbitrary will of the husband. The word of Jesus, pronouncing every

[1] Mark x. 10. [2] Matt. v. 32; but also xix. 9.

[3] Mark x. 11; Luke xvi. 18.

[4] Compare Mark x. 9 with Matt. v. 32, xix. 9. In Luke also (xvi. 18) there is an unconditional condemnation of divorce. So Paul (1 Cor. vii. 10).

divorced woman who forms a new marriage connection an adulteress,[1] has been erroneously declared to be an addition of Mark's, because it is not found in the first and third Evangelists. It is precisely this word that expresses most pointedly the opposition of Jesus to the Mosaic law of divorce. It proclaims the unrestricted equality of the wife and the husband in their family relations. It relieves the wife from the degradation to which she was consigned, ostensibly in the name of God, by Jewish usage. It states the most important principle of all Christian culture.

That Jesus rejected the principle of divorce utterly, is evident from an addition in the first Gospel itself,[2] which might indeed have been found in the Collection of Sayings, but is not in the second Gospel. The purpose of Jesus, by a very striking example to impress his disciples with the extraordinary sacrifices which his service demanded, was attained. They could now no longer have any doubt that they must give their whole hearts to it without reserve. They were at once filled with astonishment. If such were the nature of marriage, it were better — so it seemed to them — not to marry at all.[3] To renounce divorce under all circumstances, and to sacrifice to the sacredness of the principle the comfort and peace of one's whole life, appeared to them an intolerable demand. And were there not cases in which the principle required a self-restraint more than human from those who submitted to it? Jesus in reply certainly enjoins upon his disciples absolute self-denial, renunciation of marriage itself. But nothing could be more erroneous than to infer that he preferred celibacy to the marriage state, and considered it a higher moral condition. He commended single

[1] Mark x. 11, 12. [2] Matt. xix. 10–12. [3] Matt. xix. 10.

life to his disciples simply on account of their special mission. In their case it was surely a serious matter to bind themselves permanently by domestic obligations. They must perceive that, if they sought to do the work given them by Jesus, there was no alternative for them but to resign all other concerns and duties. It was they whom Jesus was thinking of when he asserted his principle in its full strength. That it was not strictly applicable to the great mass of men who were under the discipline of the law, no one knew better than he, with his thorough knowledge of men. Hence he neither concealed from himself nor from his disciples that a special gift is needed to the correct understanding and right application of his principle. Only a few chosen ones are able thoroughly to appreciate the greatness and sanctity of the domestic state. Only a few are able voluntarily to renounce domestic relations for the sake of God and the Truth, and at the same time keep themselves pure from all stain. The moral duty therefore of the disciples is twofold: to hold marriage sacred, inviolable, pure, and also to renounce marriage itself for the sake of the kingdom of heaven.[1] It was of his Apostles and of them only, under the then existing circumstances of coming persecution, that Jesus required abstinence from marriage. It was at this time probably that he pronounced a look even of unchaste desire, cast upon the wife of another, adultery, — adultery of the heart.[2] And he was thus true to his own character in requiring not only abstinence from the external sinful act, but inward freedom from impure desire.

4. As, on account of their position in the kingdom of God, Jesus required his disciples to renounce the

[1] Matt. xix. 12. [2] Matt. v. 28.

happiness of domestic life, which is in itself allowable, he had to require of them also the condition, without which such a sacrifice cannot be made in the right spirit, and which they were not yet strong enough to fulfil, namely, the pure childlike mind, which extinguishes selfish impulses and affections, and gives itself up with all the heart to the highest ends of life. Worldly expectations still dimmed their vision, and hindered their understanding of the Divine kingdom and its high aims and duties. Even in those days immediately preceding the final crisis, the vague dream of a political empire with Jesus at its head rose before them, and, in strange blindness, they distributed among themselves imaginary places of rank and power. They even betrayed their foolish wishes to their Master. To their ambitious inquiry, Who is to be the greatest in the heavenly kingdom, he replied by placing a little child among them, and, without noticing their confusion, admonishing them, with all their proud visions of the future, to become like that child, and by declaring to them anew that a childlike spirit alone enables a man to enter the kingdom of God. And he connected therewith the requirement of an entire conversion to the position of a child. In this "conversion" to the spirit of a child is comprehended all that the Gospel requires of its confessors, moral and religious purity, truthfulness, simplicity and singleness. The qualities so lovely in the child form also the distinguishing character of the disciple of Jesus. The Jewish system of formulas and forms had destroyed internal purity. Piety and morality had become creations of Art. It was on this account that it was so hard for the disciples to be simply pious and simply moral. Proud hopes and extravagant expectations were constantly obstruct-

ing their natural development, moral and religious. To all this there must now be an end, — so Jesus solemnly declared. What remained for them to do in his service was to become self-forgetful and unpretending, as they once were when they were children.[1] To this end they must make up their minds to look no longer for anything for themselves; they were simply to suffer. They were no more to desire anything, only to resign all things, devoting strength and life to the cause of mankind. In a word, they were to learn to humble themselves.[2] In renouncing all claims to honor, reputation, reward, they were to cherish also the conviction that out of this very self-humiliation, out of humble labor in the kingdom of God, springs true greatness, imperishable honor.

From these last instructions of Jesus to his disciples we gather how entirely his idea of the nature of man differed from that which is commonly entertained.

The common belief represents children as infected with hereditary sin, as fallen, even in early infancy, into the power of evil, wholly subject to wicked desires and propensities. This is not the idea of Jesus concerning childhood. He sees rather in children types of moral simplicity, examples of purity of heart, living mirrors of a pure and sincere spirit. To become as conscious of the right and as free in the conflict of life as a child in its innocence is unconscious and free, without thinking of its freedom, is, according to Jesus, the true and the highest condition of his disciples.

We understand now the love which he showed for children. How touching is it to see him taking children in his arms, laying his hands upon them, blessing them, and in impressive words giving them assurance

[1] Matt. xviii. 2.

[2] Matt. xviii. 4.

of their share in the heavenly kingdom![1] The yet unchildlike temper of the disciples is seen, on the other hand, in the harsh and arrogant way in which they repulsed those who brought their children to Jesus for his blessing. These children had received no baptism. They had been taught no catechism. Jesus nevertheless pronounced them fully accredited members of his kingdom. The spirit of childhood is the spirit well-pleasing to God. Innocence, humility, freedom from pretension, and love are the keys which open the gates of the heavenly kingdom. When Jesus looked into the innocent eyes of those children, came there not to his mind the cunning, suspicious looks of the Pharisees, who, under a bland exterior, were on the watch to catch every word of his, that they might find grounds for a capital charge against him? All the more was he stirred with a holy indignation at his disciples for their harsh repulse of the children. How long he had been laboring to breathe his spirit into these men, and how little disposed they were to receive it, was continually making itself apparent. His was indeed the pure spirit of a child. He sought and desired nothing on earth for himself. And it was just this that he required of those who sought admission to his Communion. "Whosoever receives not the kingdom of God as a child";[2] whosoever refuses to serve God and his neighbor without stipulation or selfish aims, in sincerity of mind and with hearty love; whosoever, instead of losing sight of himself, keeps himself in view even in his religion and his morality, is no true child of God, although he may have all the means of grace provided by the Church, priestly absolution and papal canonization. The childlike spirit could alone enable the dis-

[1] Mark x. 13; Matt. xix. 13; Luke xviii. 15. [2] Mark x. 15.

ciples of Jesus to labor for his kingdom without interested views. True piety liberates the mind from an unworthy dependence on wealth and selfish enjoyment. It renders one ready for self-sacrifice, strong to suffer when the supreme good is at stake, and at the same time gentle and peaceably disposed towards blind and bitter enemies.

Immediately after instructing his disciples upon the subject of marriage, Jesus had occasion to show them by an example how barren the best intentions are without this childlike spirit. A teacher of the law, moved by a better feeling than actuated his class, asked Jesus the way to eternal life.[1] Jesus replied, obedience to the Ten Commandments. The scribe declared that he had followed this way, but had not found the peace which forever satisfies the deepest want of the soul. Jesus then made upon him the demand which only the pure, childlike spirit is able to comply with, namely, the unreserved devotion of all his earthly goods to the service of the Divine kingdom. This he required, not of every one who sought admission to his Communion, but only of those who would labor with him in his great work, and be Apostles in his missionary field. The teacher of the law was not equal to this requirement. He lacked the childlike spirit necessary to a prominent position in the kingdom of God.

The conversation with this teacher of the law is of special significance in the light which it throws upon the character of Jesus. The teacher, learned in the law, addressed Jesus with the title, "Good Master." Doubtless it was to his no small surprise that Jesus disclaimed the appellation "Good," and with the re-

[1] Mark x. 17.

mark that this title belongs only to God.[1] It is evident why the later tradition[2] took offence at this disclaimer of Jesus and sought to deprive it of its offensive point. As the idea of Jesus passed, even as early as the second half of the first century, from the light of history into the twilight of the miraculous and the legendary, his real human figure became clothed with Divine glory. That Jesus should have deemed himself unworthy to be called "Good," seemed incomprehensible. If, as was generally received, he were of a Divine nature, the "Logos," of equal nature with God, how could he, not only distinguish God from himself, but even subordinate himself morally to God? This disclaimer was without doubt to be found in the primitive documents. The first Evangelist endeavored to do it away by putting in the mouth of the teacher of the Law, whom by the way he calls "a young man,"[3] the inquiry what "good thing" he should do in order to win eternal life; and Jesus is made to ask in reply why the young man inquired of him about the "good," as there is only One good? This alteration of an original declaration of Jesus by an Evangelist is instructive. It shows how, even so early as before the end of the first century, embarrassing opinions led to arbitrary changes, in the evangelical tradition, of utterances of Jesus unquestionably genuine. The account of this passage in the first Evangelist gives a wholly inappropriate meaning to it. To the question of the teacher what good thing he should do, Jesus could not possibly have answered with a rebuke, and still less with the assertion that "One is good." In both particulars such a reply would have been unsuitable and without meaning. If Jesus

[1] Mark x. 18; Luke xviii. 19. [2] Matt. xix. 17.
[3] Matt. xix. 22.

at once peremptorily disclaimed the quality "good," as according to the oldest tradition he did, he could not have done so out of mere politeness or from false modesty. His declining the title is all-sufficient evidence of his deep and solemn conviction that it did not belong to him. Only the Eternally Perfect, the source of all good things, from whose holy fulness all other moral beings draw life, can be called "good" in the full, unqualified sense of the word. In this sense Jesus neither could nor would be esteemed "good." Often enough had he felt the charm of temptation. Long enough had he been passing through severe moral conflicts; and so had his moral being been unfolded. He had not yet triumphantly withstood the last temptation and won the last battle. The great trial was still before him. And if on all occasions he had come off conqueror it was because there were required of him persevering efforts, constant labor, inviolable obedience to the will of his Heavenly Father in order to be more and more perfect.[1] God alone is exalted above all temptation,[2] unchangeable, and therefore perfectly good. The explicit declaration of Jesus that the epithet "good" did not apply to him affords at the same time direct proof that he did not seek to place himself on an equality with God, as his enemies objected to him.[3] Before the Infinitely High and Holy One, his Father in heaven, he bowed in profound humility, not only on the side of his mortal nature, but also in regard to his spirit. Even in the fourth Gospel there are preserved traces of utterances of Jesus most explicit to the effect that between himself and God, the Heavenly Father, there is an essential difference not to be forgotten. He says there, it is true, that he will

[1] See especially Hebr. v. 8. [2] James i. 13. [3] John v. 18.

give eternal life to his followers, "his sheep." While, according to the other Gospels, eternal life must be struggled for through a voluntary renunciation of earthly good. But according to the fourth Gospel, Jesus omits not to add that the Father is greater than all,[1] i. e. is unconditionally supreme by virtue of the unity and majesty of His being. And by the declaration: "I and the Father are one,"[2] Jesus maintains, not an equality of nature, but simply the unity of his will with the Father, which appears in the conformity of his work and his life with the Divine pleasure. For this reason he could say also, that the Father was in him and he in the Father.[3]

5. In the interview with the teacher of the Law, the source of a false disposition of mind was revealed. It is the most conspicuous mark of the childlike spirit that it is perfectly indifferent to earthly possessions, free from the thirst for gain, and independent of the goods of this world. Love for earthly goods prevented this man learned in the Law from joining the Apostles and the other laborers in the kingdom of God. Under the fresh impression of this experience, Jesus declared that the rich could hardly enter the kingdom of God, that indeed it was easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the Divine kingdom.[4] This declaration not only contains a sharp reproof of the pupil of the Law, but it is also the expression of a deep sense of the spiritual danger of wealth. It was absolutely necessary, from the nature of their work, that the Apostles should resign all earthly possessions. Given up to an unsettled, wandering life, with no abiding place on earth, in ceaseless

[1] John x. 2. [2] John x. 30. [3] John x. 38.
[4] Mark x. 24; Luke xviii. 24; Matt. xix. 23.

conflict with persecution and danger, devoting all their time and strength to the work of extending and confirming the Divine kingdom, they were not in a condition to attend to property or money. They had to look to the friends of the Gospel for the means of subsistence, or, when this resource failed, to obtain them by the labor of their hands. That Jesus therefore required his disciples to renounce earthly good, was by no means equivalent to maintaining the incompatibility of property and wealth with the kingdom of God.

But here he declared wealth itself a positive obstacle to entrance into the kingdom. And there comes, it must be admitted, the question whether Jesus exacted voluntary poverty of the members of his Communion, or at least whether he considered a limited amount of property a necessary condition of adhesion to the cause of the Gospel? At all events, it is evident from this declaration, that, up to this time, it was almost exclusively only persons of the poorer class who had proved to be his faithful followers and self-sacrificing friends. He does not mean to lay down a universal rule. But he could not be blind to a melancholy fact of almost daily experience. It was the religion of the poor and the oppressed that he published, a peculiar Association from among the people that he gathered. It certainly was not his settled opinion that wealth is in itself sinful and to be condemned. It cannot, however, be denied that the rich are exposed to the great temptation of putting a false trust in external good. And that trust in riches prevents a cheerful and self-denying devotion to the kingdom of God,[1] Jesus had just

[1] Mark (x. 24) gives us the declaration of Jesus in its original form; in Matthew (xix. 23) and Luke (xviii. 24) we have the later tradition. See Appendix, Ill. 23, p. 138.

had evidence. How peculiarly hard is it for the rich to seek support only in moral good! Generally speaking, how haughty, how heartless, how heedless of the wants of those less favored by fortune, does their wealth render the rich! Unquestionably the possessor of even a limited amount of property is exposed to this danger; and in the sense of this danger the disciples exclaimed: "Who, under such circumstances, can obtain salvation!" Jesus put an end to their astonishment with the quieting word that what is impossible with men is possible with God. The spirit of self-sacrifice, which has gone forth from Jesus, consecrates even the possession of earthly wealth. It teaches us to discern its inconstancy and insufficiency, when it does not serve the eternal interests of life. It dedicates earthly good to the supreme good, and thus causes that to be possible with God which seems impossible to men.

It is characteristic of the forward character of Peter, that he was the first to speak and assure his Master that he and his companions had practised the required self-renunciation, and had left all to follow him. The disciples, it seems, had not been wholly without property; and it had doubtless cost them many a struggle before they resolved to turn their backs upon property and money, house and home, wife and child.[1] But the answer of Jesus is very remarkable. All that his disciples had relinquished for his sake and the Gospel's, houses, brothers, sisters, mothers, children and parents, according to his explicit assurance should be made good to them a hundred-fold in this world.[2] That this assurance was very early variously understood, appears from the different forms in which it is found in the first and third Gospels. In the first, Jesus is rep-

[1] Mark x. 28; Matt. xix. 27; Luke xviii. 28. [2] Mark x. 29.

resented as saying, that at the restoration of all things he will appear in regal glory, and establish anew the empire of the Twelve Tribes. He promises to each of his disciples, as a reward for his present self-sacrifices, the rank of Prince of a tribe, a throne by the side of his own glorious throne, and for all the loss suffered a hundred-fold compensation.[1] A manifold compensation Jesus promises, according to the third Gospel, in "this time,"[2] while, according to this same Gospel, the restoration of the kingdom of the Twelve Tribes and the establishment of twelve thrones for his disciples were first promised by him after the administration of the Supper.[3] It is especially worthy of note that, in both these Gospels, the hundred-fold compensation relates to *wives* also.[4] Jesus could not have spoken to his disciples after this manner. He, who so often and so expressly asserted, from the beginning of his career, that his kingdom rested on a moral basis alone, that he sought to form a Communion in truth, in righteousness and in love, that whosoever labored for the sake of reward was an unprofitable servant, and that the only reward that he offered was life eternal, — he could not possibly have set before his disciples the prospect of a restoration of the Old Testament theocracy and hierarchy increased a hundred-fold in possessions and enjoyments. He could not possibly have consoled them with the assurance that they should receive for one house a hundred houses, for one child a hundred children, for one wife a hundred wives, as a reward for their fidelity to his Gospel.

As this promise is found in the first and third Gospels, it is evident that the expectation of the return of

[1] Matt. xix. 28.
[2] Luke xviii. 29.
[3] Luke xxii. 29.
[4] Matt. xix. 29; Luke xviii. 29.

Christ took very early a gross material form among those who held to the Jewish Christian traditions, which these two Gospels chiefly followed. The original meaning of Jesus was early lost among them. Happily it is preserved in its genuine form in the second Gospel, wherein Jesus is recorded to have promised his disciples that compensation a hundredfold would be made them, "with persecutions,"[1] for the losses suffered by persecution. It is just this addition, which is wanting in the first and third Gospels, that proves indisputably that the declaration is not to be taken in its literal sense. Persecutions are and will continue to be, according to this assurance, the lot which awaits his disciples *in this time*. A permanent condition on this earth will no more be theirs, to say nothing of a state of quiet and comfort. But brotherly love among Christians, where that reigns, will have power to sweeten the bitterest lot. There brothers have all things in common.[2] In the day of need, one member so far as his circumstances permit, generously places his earthly goods at the disposal of another. Whoever once owned a house, to him a hundred houses open. Instead of one brother, one sister, one father and mother, there are now a hundred brothers and sisters, a hundred fathers and mothers ready to cheer and nourish him. A hundred fields, instead of the one field lost, yield him their produce. So long as he needs relief, all who in common with him confess the name of Jesus share with him what they have. With such benefactions of Christian love, the sufferings of this time lose their sting, and even the sorest destitution is thus rendered a source of inexhaustible blessing.

[1] Mark x. 30.

[2] See Acts ii. 44.

5. Such consolation did the Master give his disciples upon his last journey to Jerusalem. During his abode in Judea he had probably made in passing several short visits to the capital.[1] For the lamentation poured forth over the city of the Temple, (wrought by the first Evangelist according to his custom, into a longer discourse of Jesus,)[2] refers not to repeated visits to Jerusalem, but to repeated labors in the city during his final residence in Judea. Upon this last journey to Jerusalem, the disciples several times sought to obtain from Jesus some authority for their visions of the Messianic empire. If we have any doubt that he gave them no hope of receiving a hundred-fold increase of their earthly possessions and of sitting on twelve thrones, the way in which he treated those dreams would dissipate it.

It was the sons of Zebedee, James and John, who, at that solemn and weighty moment, besought a special favor of Jesus:[3] nothing less than to appoint them to the first rank in the approaching distribution of the offices and dignities of the heavenly kingdom. It would be inconceivable how these men, belonging to the most intimate circle of the disciples of Jesus, could be under the influence of so gross an error, if we did not know from experience what power ambition has, and the hierarchical passion for ruling, to blind the clearest vision. Jesus had in fact but just before declared anew that he was going to meet suffering and death;[4] and now these two disciples desired a posi-

[1] Luke xiii. 34. [2] Matt. xxiii. 37.

[3] Mark x. 35; Matt. xx. 20. Mark has the older tradition, nearest to the original. The later tradition, out of consideration for the Apostles, represents the mother of the sons of Zebedee as preferring the request.

[4] Mark x. 32; Matt. xx. 17; Luke xviii. 31.

tive assurance of a higher reward in the future, to sustain them in the trouble that was immediately at hand.

With wonderful patience, but also with inflexible firmness, Jesus set them right. They should drink of his cup. They should be baptized with his baptism. They should share in his sufferings and death. They should be persecuted and ill-treated like him for the sake of truth and righteousness. Such was his answer. In adding that to sit on his right and on his left in his kingdom, as these disciples desired, depended not on him but on God,[1] he declared distinctly that his kingdom was not a worldly one.[2] Had he been the founder of an earthly empire, it would have been in his power to reward his adherents with worldly honors and distinctions. Jesus seized this occasion to instruct his disciples more particularly as to the nature of his kingdom and of the honor and rank which have worth therein. There is indeed in his kingdom, according to these further revelations of Jesus, the distinction of great and small, high and low. But the relation of the two classes to one another, is essentially different from that which exists in the kingdoms of the world. Jesus himself states the distinguishing mark in this respect of the kingdom founded by him. Worldly empires are supported by force, military force especially, which does not necessarily imply that they do not rest upon principles of right, but they execute their will, when they are resisted, with the sword. Against such as oppose them they employ inexorable force. The kingdom of God, on the other hand, excludes all force from its communion. It rests upon the free accord and co-operation of its members. Hence whoso-

[1] Mark x. 40; Matt. xx. 23. [2] Luke xvii. 20.

ever desires to take a "great" or high position there, must begin with renouncing all claims to temporal power. It is "little," inconsistent, irrational, in the heavenly kingdom, to aim at the exercise of temporal dominion.

Nothing is clearer, according to these words of Jesus, than that he never had the remotest idea of establishing a "church" to be supported by force. His only thought was to form a free Association of men faithful to their convictions, drawn to his Cause through an impulse from within and by hearty interest and love, and striving with him and with all of a like mind to accomplish its ends. The idea of "ruling" or of government is nowhere to be found, according to Jesus, in the vocabulary of the Gospel. Whoever is great, shows his greatness in a way directly the reverse, by readiness to serve. He is the greatest or "first" of all who serves the most; and the rank of a member of the divine kingdom is determined by the amount and importance of his services.

The ideal of moral and religious greatness, which had formed itself with steadily increasing clearness in the mind of Jesus, he could not set before his disciples more plainly than by his own example. They were to be his followers, to continue his work. But the end of his work he now described by saying that "he had come not to be served, but to serve, and to give his life a ransom for many."[1] The greatest service rendered by Jesus to mankind was unquestionably his voluntary devotion of himself to death in their behalf. And his disciples in like manner could best serve humanity by showing themselves ready to give up their lives for the diffusion of the Gospel among both Jews and Gentiles.

[1] Mark x. 45; Matt. xx. 28.

This declaration of Jesus concerning the purpose of his death has great interest for us now for a special reason. It is the only declaration of the kind. And as it was made at the point of time when he was on his last journey to Jerusalem, it is especially interesting to learn from his own lips what significance he himself ascribed to his death, and what he regarded as the important result of it.

He describes the sacrifice of his life as a price, a "ransom" by which those for whom it was sacrificed were set free. In speaking of the ransomed as "many" he looks beyond the borders of the Jewish Communion into the Gentile world, whither his disciples were appointed to carry the word of the Cross. As at another time he called the people and the nations, who needed help, "the weary and the heavy laden,"[1] so now they appear to him as "prisoners." The condition of a prisoner is so pitiable that it commands universal sympathy. Losing his personal liberty, man loses nearly all the joy and life of life. In such a situation, both among Jews and Gentiles, were the people so called. Almost all public burdens were thrown upon the lower and middle classes. They were for the most part deprived of the precious blessing of civil and social freedom; and by their dependent and oppressed condition, were in manifold ways exposed to the temptation of the grosser sins and vices. They were in the fullest sense of the word in servitude. To liberate them from this abject condition of slavery, to bring them truth, freedom, righteousness, joy, peace, love, the comfort of expiation and forgiveness, the consciousness of their human worth, and the fresh, glad sense of life flowing therefrom, to invite them to par-

[1] Matt. xi. 28.

ticipate in the enjoyment of the moral and spiritual good, which alone gives to human life an enduring value and a new sanctity, to insure to them, as to the hitherto privileged higher classes, their portion in the imperishable good of our being, was one of the first objects of the work of Jesus.

In order to accomplish this object, it was necessary that he should devote himself to death. Only by his death could the obstacle to the development of the true destiny of Israel and of all other nations as well, be overcome. This obstacle was the stiff inflexible letter of forms and formulas, which had killed the spirit of love in Jew and Gentile in civil and social life. In deference to the authority of his Law which he worshipped, the Jew hated the Gentile and excluded him from the blessings of salvation. The priest looked with contempt upon the common laity standing far beneath him. Among the Gentiles, the free citizen refused even personal rights to the slave and considered him as a thing dead. Countries conquered in war, prisoners taken in battle, were treated with cruelty. Among the Jews there was no respect for the dignity of woman. This state of things was made sacred by the letter of the Law and the Statute. The Wrong, flourishing in the world before Christ and established by usage in the place of the Right, must be expiated. The letter of righteousness was to be overcome by the spirit of righteousness. The dominion of the letter was bound to kill Jesus, in order that it might die itself with him. He died, as according to the letter of the Law he justly deserved. He had taken a stand in irreconcilable opposition thereto. It came now to the point that the spirit of freedom and love that inspired him must break with the Statute.

And the faith with which he went to his death showed that the spirit was stronger than the letter and formula of the Law. With death he paid the Statute its last debt. All it could do was to destroy the most righteous person that the centuries had ever seen. It had become empty, hollow, senseless. But he lived, lived on in his spirit, in his word, in his love, in the religious body which testified of him. By his death the Jewish Law was condemned. A blessed stream of life flowed into the world from the blood that flowed from him. Thus his death was the victory of freedom and love, the fountain of a new and higher righteousness for Jew and Gentile, a ransom for the prisoners in Israel and in the whole Gentile world. At the same time, pain and suffering were hallowed by him as making manifest in the most exalted manner the Divine among men. He glorified self-sacrifice as the most perfect revelation of heavenly justice and love.

In his giving up his life as a ransom "in the place of many," there is nothing at variance with truth and reason. It was doubtless the special duty of the "prisoners" to help themselves, and by self-sacrifice secure the blessings of which they were deprived. But we know from daily experience how individuals are continually called to contend and struggle for the highest interests of life, to suffer and so to help the "many." Jesus carried in his heart the consciousness of being the champion and liberator of many, and particularly at that time when he was about to undertake the fatal journey to Jerusalem. It had now become to him an irrevocable conviction, that he was to contend and suffer and die, as a sacrifice for the persecuted and oppressed portion of mankind, as the friend and brother of the poor, the protector of the miserable upon whom

the leaders in Church and State were wont to look down with indifference and contempt. Thus the idea of the Deliverer going to meet death is put in the purest light. That he knew himself, not as the representative of the distinguished, the prosperous and the rich; that he relinquished utterly all human approval, all honor, all aid from these classes; that he sought nothing more nor less than to be the helper and rescuer of those who found nowhere else a heart to help and a hand to save them; that his death was a death met in the service of poverty and of sorrow, of the outcast and the perishing, — this is the divine seal which the Eternal Father himself impressed upon his word, when he said that he gave up his life as a ransom for many. Therefore upon the very darkest pages of the history of the nations the name of Jesus shines like a star.

NOTE.

[Throughout this whole chapter the reader cannot fail to perceive what we have already presumed to indicate as, in our estimation, the defect of Dr. Schenkel's representation of Jesus. That Jesus was deeply interested in the instruction of his immediate disciples and that he gave them the wisest rules for their guidance, there can be no question. But Dr. Schenkel sets him before us altogether too strongly in the light of a tutor, drilling them, so to speak, for a special office, and, consequently, as giving utterance to the grandest truths not so much from an irrepressible sense of their essential and infinite worth and world-wide importance as with a view to a certain effect. But, as we listen to Jesus, he seems to us to be not so much forming a church, gathering a communion, as publishing the eternal laws of the spirit written in the nature of all men, declaring the truth which concerns all men as men, discoursing not of a kingdom of his own, which he was to construct, but of the ever-present, all-embracing, everlast-

ing kingdom of God. He speaks not altogether, nor chiefly, in obedience and response to a call from without, but from the rich, overflowing fulness within. Outward circumstances, it is true, gave him occasion, but the well-spring of truth and power was in his own being.

Thus in the account given in the foregoing chapter of the manner in which Jesus received children, one misses the naturalness of the incident. Upon a certain occasion when a great crowd was gathered round him, some women tried to get near him with their children, that they might see him and that he might take notice of them. His disciples, without being especially "unchildlike," naturally thought the importunity of these mothers intrusive and an interruption. The disciples simply did not know their Master, who expressed himself on the occasion far more from the deep tenderness of his nature than with any view to effect.

Take again the incident commented upon in the foregoing chapter, the interview of Jesus with the rich youth. It appears to us there is a great deal more of living, natural truth in it than our author gives us the idea of. On a certain occasion a young man of wealth came running to Jesus, and, kneeling down before him, asked, "Good Master! what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" Before answering his question Jesus disclaimed the appellation of "good," observing that there was only one good, — God. Now, as Jesus, when he looked upon this youth, "loved him," may we not infer that his appearance was in no ordinary degree prepossessing? There was doubtless an air of ingenuousness about him that went to the heart of Jesus, and a tone of sincerity in his address that made Jesus feel that there was more in it than mere custom or ordinary courtesy dictated. It came to him from those ingenuous lips — that appellation of "Good" — as something more than an unmeaning formality, and it seems to me that in disclaiming it he spoke almost as much to himself as to the young man, for he paused not for any reply. For the instant, the winning charm of the youth's appearance and manner was so strong that Jesus instinctively repelled the seductive flattery, as much to guard himself as to reprove the youth. Jesus is commonly considered as having imposed a very severe condition upon this young seeker of life in that he required him to sell all that he had. But does not this incident attest the wisdom of Jesus, his moderation, his freedom from all desire for partisans? Just as on another

occasion when the same question was put to him (Luke x. 25), so now, he made no personal claim upon the young man. As he referred the scribe to the Law and what was written there, so he bade this youth keep the commandments of God. And it was because the youth was not satisfied and desired to know what further was needful that Jesus told him that if he would be perfect, if he would fulfil the highest idea of duty, he must dispose of his property in the best way possible, and come and join in his great work. This requisition was so entirely wise under the circumstances, it was so obviously necessary that any one who joined Jesus should not be encumbered with property, which furthermore could not be secure in the times that were at hand, when life itself, to say nothing of property, would be in constant danger, that no inference can be drawn from this case as to the views held by Jesus in regard to the holding of property. The young man, habituated to the indulgences of wealth, was naturally enough unequal to so great a sacrifice, excellent and amiable as he was. And so he who just now came running to Jesus with all the ardent self-confidence of youth, and with a countenance beaming with goodness and sincerity, turns with downcast looks, sad and chagrined, away. As he moved away, Jesus "looked round" upon his disciples and exclaimed: "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God!" And when upon the faces of his disciples the greatest astonishment was depicted at these words (Mark. x. 24), he reiterated the declaration in still stronger terms, but not without a touch of the tenderness of mind produced by the affectionate interest which the young man had awakened: "*Children!*" he said, "how hard is it for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God! It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God." What is this but the strong language in which deep feeling always delights, and which is never to be understood without qualification, never to be taken as the expression of a deliberate judgment? The case of this rich youth moved Jesus very deeply, showing as it did what an obstacle wealth was to a self-sacrificing devotion to the truth of God. Here was a young man, so blameless and so good that one could not look into his face without loving him, and yet utterly disabled by his riches from taking part in the great work and serving in the kingdom of God. He had no strength or will for the privations and self-sacrifices which that service made unavoidable.

If such an one as he could not enter the divine kingdom or service, what rich man could? Was it not perfectly natural that, in view of such an instance, Jesus should have created in him, a feeling of the difficulty in the way of the rich so strong at the moment that he could give no adequate expression to it, except by comparing it to a physical impossibility? His disciples were only the more amazed, "astonished out of measure." And here Dr. Schenkel is led into a misunderstanding, I apprehend, of the expression of their astonishment, "Who then can be saved?" by attaching a more modern idea to the word "saved," and by supposing the disciples to have had a more spiritual conception of salvation than they had then reached. The salvation which, in common with all their countrymen, the disciples were looking for, was the coming rich and glorious kingdom of the Messiah. And when Jesus declared that the rich could not enter the kingdom, they were confounded, and this exclamation of theirs, Who then can be saved! was precisely the same as if they had said, How then can there be any grand kingdom, if there are to be no rich men in it? What Jesus said in reply was accompanied or preceded, it would seem, by a very impressive look, for it is noted in the first two Gospels that he "beheld" them,—"looked upon them," as he answered: "With men it is impossible, but not with God: for with God all things are possible"; i. e. "It may seem impossible to you, how there can be any salvation without riches and honors, but it is possible with God." It was all that he could say. They could not understand at once the nature of the divine kingdom, of the true salvation. This was a matter which it was to take them their lifetime rightly to comprehend. But this declaration of Jesus by no means satisfied his disciples. Mark now how Peter, speaking as he was wont for the others as well as for himself, betrays his mercenary motives and theirs, and shows that to whatever privations they had all submitted, whatever self-sacrifices they had thus far made, it had all been done in no right spirit, but in full expectation of being repaid in kind when their Master should ascend the throne of the Messiah. "Look!" exclaimed Peter, "we have left all and followed thee, what shall we have, therefore?" It is somewhat surprising that our acute author finds so much difficulty in understanding the answer of Jesus to Peter, and so evidently misses its point. In reply to Peter, Jesus assures him that for all that they gave up for the kingdom of God, they should receive a hundred-fold in this life, and

had he said a thousand, it would still have been only an inadequate statement of a fact. For what amount of temporal blessings can be compared in value with the conscious possession of the truth and spirit of God? Did not the Apostles have the richest experience of their Master's promise, when in after years they made the dungeons into which they were cast ring like so many palaces with the hymns of their triumphant joy? But doubtless, at the moment that he gave them this promise, they confidently understood him to mean that for all that they had forsaken they were to be paid in kind. Hence, how natural it is that the construction, which, with the ideas of the divine kingdom that they then had, they put upon his promise, should have very early crept into one of the reports of it, and he should be recorded (as in the first Gospel) to have told them that they should sit upon twelve thrones, judging every one a tribe of Israel. This was without doubt what at the time they honestly understood him to mean. The disciples through Peter, having thus, with a childlike transparency, shown their hearts to Jesus and their expectation that they were going to gain peculiar advantages from being the first to join him, he goes on to tell them that many that are first will be last and the last will be first, and to illustrate this saying by the parable of the householder, who hired laborers to work in his vineyard at different hours of the day, and at the end of the day paid them all alike. This parable, by the way, is commonly entirely misunderstood. Its object manifestly was to teach the disciples that they were not to expect to gain any advantage over those, who, in the Providence of Heaven, should come after them into the service of Truth, and who would gladly have come earlier had they had the opportunity. The eleventh-hour men in the parable had not refused to work before. Their not working was their mishap, not their fault.

Our author hardly does justice to the grand answer which Jesus makes to the petition of James and John, who asked for the two highest places in his kingdom. The definition which he gave of true Power on that occasion does it not rank with his greatest sayings? Is it not destined to revolutionize the world? Whosoever will be great let him serve. Mankind, says Jesus, as a great philosopher has since said of Nature, to be commanded must be served. — TRANS.]

SIXTH SECTION.

THE CRISIS.

CHAPTER XX.

THE OLD TEMPLE AND THE NEW.

1. During his last sojourn in Judea, Jesus, as we have already said, probably visited the city of Jerusalem several times, although the fact is not expressly stated in the first three Gospels, only his public and solemn entrance into the city claiming their attention. The fourth Evangelist, on the other hand, who, besides, has made use of but scanty records of the career of Jesus in Galilee, has drawn his statements almost exclusively from original documents relating to the final abode of Jesus in Judea. And these he has used with the understanding that Jesus went several times to the national feasts at Jerusalem, and thence returned again to Galilee.

The leaders of the hierarchical party in Jerusalem had doubtless followed the course of Jesus in Galilee with great attention, and soon with growing excitement. Individuals had been deputed, as we have related, to go from Jerusalem to Galilee and investigate the scandal which Jesus had caused. And, in the course of things, it had become clearer and clearer to the chief men of the high Council that a decisive conflict between the theocratical constitution and the God's kingdom established by Jesus was inevitable.

How favorably was the game now standing for the ruling party! They had the power in their hands. They could at any moment institute legal proceedings against Jesus. They seem, however, for a considerable time to have shrunk from any openly hostile act. They contented themselves for a while with endeavoring covertly to undermine the reputation of Jesus. They sought to render him an object of suspicion among the people. They pronounced him a fool, a madman. They perverted as much as possible his most innocent expressions, his purest views. On the other hand, he was protected from a public prosecution, partly by his popularity, partly by his moderation, prudence and wisdom.

When, in opposition to this last statement, he is represented as the object of deadly persecution from the very beginning, it is because this idea rests upon the erroneous assumption of the fourth Evangelist; namely, that the extreme state of feeling existing between Jesus and his opposers, which could only have been the consequence of a series of foregone incidents and complications, began with the very commencement of his public life, which is simply impossible. The hostility of the hierarchical party was a steady but only gradual growth, and it required the strongest incentive to excite their hatred to the pitch of determining to put a violent end to his career upon the charge of a capital crime.

Even in the fourth Gospel itself, there are traces of the true order of events. Although, according to this Gospel, the "Jews" were on the one hand ceaselessly busy in the attempt to execute their murderous plots against Jesus,[1] yet it is evident, on the other

[1] John vii. 1, 19; viii. 37, 40, 59; x. 31, 39.

hand, that it was during his last abode in Judea that they first formed the resolve to devote their victim to death.[1] Up to the time of his last journey to Jerusalem, there reigned in the Council great indecision in reference to the measures to be adopted against him. There is no trace of a concerted, well-defined plan of several years' standing to put him out of the way. It is only a sudden word of the presiding High Priest, Caiaphas, together with the weight of his opinion, that decides the Council that the life of a man, who was growing more and more dangerous every hour, must be sacrificed to the good of the whole.[2]

By what motives now was the hierarchical party impelled to the momentous resolution to institute proceedings against Jesus? To this question, the first three Gospels give an answer entirely different from that of the fourth Gospel. According to the latter, it was the miraculous resurrection of Lazarus that greatly alarmed the High Council, and hastened the long-delayed measure.[3] That the first three Gospels make no mention of the raising of Lazarus, does not indeed prove that the fact is a pure invention of the fourth Evangelist, but it certainly shows that it cannot have had the consequence which the fourth Evangelist ascribes to it. The first three Evangelists could not have passed it over in entire silence, if it were the special and essential cause of the legal prosecution of Jesus. But even the fourth Gospel says nothing of the resurrection of Lazarus as a ground of accusation made use of against Jesus at his trial. In the proceedings of the High Council itself, mention is indeed made according to the fourth Gospel by the enemies

[1] John xi. 53.
[2] John xi. 47.
[3] John xi. 46.

of Jesus, of the "many signs" wrought by him.[1] But they are not spoken of as among the special reasons of the accusation and the sentence. The remark of Caiaphas in the final sitting of the Council that, if Jesus were suffered to go on unchecked, the coming in of the Romans and the ruin of the theocratic government were to be feared,[2] points to a reason very different from a miraculous resurrection, which could hardly have had for consequences the official interference of the Romans and the change of the hierarchical constitution. Besides, upon closer examination, a contradiction discloses itself in the narrative of the fourth Gospel. When Jesus received intelligence of the deadly plots of his enemies, he retired in order to escape them to the little city of Judea, Ephraim. The utmost caution was needed, as he was virtually declared an outlaw.[3] Nevertheless, he left his place of retreat without any hesitation six days before the Feast of the Passover and betook himself to Bethany, the very spot where the miracle so eventful for him is said to have been wrought. And further. There in Bethany he consented to attend an entertainment given with a certain degree of show, thus drawing, almost with design apparently, public attention to himself. And then from Bethany he made a formal entrance into Jerusalem amidst the acclamations of the people, thus giving into the hands of the hierarchical party the most powerful weapons against him and exposing himself to suspicion even in the eyes of the unprejudiced. All these difficulties disappear of themselves, when we assume with the first three Evangelists that, after a sojourn of some length in Judea and occasional visits to Jerusalem, Jesus, shortly before the Passover, made

[1] John xi. 47. [2] John xi. 48. [3] John xi. 54–57.

a solemn entrance into the city, and that up to this time no positive steps had been taken against him by the High Council. It is only upon this supposition that no unfavorable light falls upon the character of Jesus. It is a manifest trait of his character, that he never needlessly exposed himself to danger, and never without the most urgent occasion offered any new nourishment to the suspicion of which he was the object. He was careful to avoid hazarding his personal safety by rashly inflaming his enemies to acts of violence. Had a sentence of death, even only as a preliminary step, been already pronounced upon him on the part of the High Council, had an order for his arrest been issued [1] on account of the political dangers with which the constitution of the Jewish state was threatened through him, — the entertainment at Bethany and the entry into the city of the Temple, prepared with so much deliberation, — this bold appearance in the very citadel of the highest temporal and spiritual authorities would be, not only an historical, but also a moral enigma.

The enigma is solved by the supposition that up to the day of his entrance into the city no decisive resolution had been formed by the opposing party, and no hostile measures taken. Thus far the Pharisees had been laying their snares for him at every step. But they had not been able to entrap him. Until now there had been so little cause for a capital charge against him, that they had to watch every word of his, in order to find some ground for a legal accusation. *His solemn entry into Jerusalem changed the situation of things.* This it was that first gave the hierarchical party a weapon to be used against him with effect.

[1] John xi. 53 – 57.

Now at last he had come forth with an apparent claim at least to a public character, which might be construed as showing criminal designs unfavorable to the stability of the Jewish Constitution and its sacred traditions.

2. That it was not by mere accident that Jesus, at the close of his labors in Judea, made a formal and public entry into Jerusalem, all the Evangelists agree. He not only made particular arrangements for the occasion, which the later tradition represents as suggested by a miraculous foreknowledge,[1] but as he approached the city he allowed his disciples to pay him extraordinary homage.[2] The people had received information of his coming, evidently not without his consent, for they flocked to meet him in great numbers and received him in the most festal manner, with royal honors, strewing green branches before him, and shouting, "Hosanna! Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord! Blessed be the kingdom of our father David that cometh in the name of the Lord!"[3] If, according to the fourth Gospel, the popular excitement were the consequence of the raising of Lazarus, the multitude would have cried: "Here comes the Awakener of the dead!" They would have streamed forth to meet him and praise and thank him for that great deed.[4] But the correctness of this account in the fourth Gospel is very doubtful. That Jesus, with whom it was a rule to avoid all display in working his miracles and to impose silence on those upon whom they were wrought, who, moreover, attached so little

[1] Mark xi. 3; Matt. xxi. 3; Luke xix. 30; John xii. 16.
[2] Mark xi. 7; Matt. xxi. 7; Luke xix. 35.
[3] Mark xi. 9; Matt. xxi. 9; Luke xix. 38.
[4] John xii. 9, 17.

value to his wonder-working gift that he lamented rather when signs and miracles were demanded of him as his credentials, should have consented, — nay, that he should himself have prepared a festal procession to glorify one of his miracles, is simply impossible. If, as is not to be doubted, he had in view a solemn entry into Jerusalem, attended by the lively sympathy of the pilgrims on their way to the Feast of the Passover, the impelling motive thereto must have been something other than the resurrection of Lazarus.

The hour had now come when Jesus had to declare himself to be the Messiah, and in a meaning of the word altogether opposed to the theocratic expectations of the nation, — the founder of a new moral and religious Communion resting on the foundations of truth, righteousness, freedom, equality, salvation for all, and especially for the miserable and the poor among the people. The necessity for this declaration came with the moment that he made his appearance for the first time at the seat of the theocratic power in the midst of the people gathered to celebrate the greatest national festival of the Jews. Here in Jerusalem, amidst the festal music of the great Jubilee, under the eyes of the assembled nation, on the threshold of its most cherished sanctuary, surrounded by his mighty and formidable opposers, he dared not wrap himself in an ambiguous silence. Here and now, before all and especially before his foes, he must declare his purpose and who he was. Slowly, step by step, as we have seen, his Messianic consciousness had been formed into full clearness in opposition to all the theocratic expectations. He had made himself known, first to the smaller, and then to the larger company of his disciples. He had prepared them for the inevitable consequences

of this his public appearance in his high office. He had placed before them in the plainest manner the privations, sufferings, and persecutions that awaited them.

They had, without doubt, spread abroad with great eagerness in these last days the intelligence that in him the promises of the fathers were fulfilled in an unlooked for manner, in a sense far higher than that in which they were commonly understood. And, as is usual in such cases, the news had flown with lightning speed from mouth to mouth. That it was wholly misunderstood by the multitude was natural. The people had no idea of any but the Old Testament Messiah, the son of David. And that Jesus, as King of Israel, would bring them deliverance from the yoke of the priesthood and of Rome, they considered as good as proved. Under this impression they crowded to meet him upon his entry into Jerusalem. The hierarchical party made no attempt to prevent their doing him homage. While they were surprised at it, they welcomed with silent satisfaction every step that led to the longed for crisis. Jesus himself desired that things should come to a final settlement. His enemies, hitherto always concealed, — they were ever on the watch, — would now quit their concealment. The keepers and guardians of the great national interests and sanctities were now to declare openly for or against his work. On this account he did not prevent the people from solemnly hailing him as the Messiah coming in the name of the Lord,[1] and with whom was coming also the kingdom of their father David.[2]

The people who met Jesus with their acclamations had very vague notions of what was to be immediately

[1] Ps. cxviii. 26. [2] Mark xi. 10.

expected of him. But that it was not his design to possess himself of the throne of David by force, they well knew from what they had learned from his disciples; and all that they had thus far seen or heard of him could have produced no other impression.

The entry into Jerusalem was altogether pacific in character. Jesus rode into the city (not with any intentional reference to a prophecy[1]) upon the foal of an ass, the symbol of patience and gentleness. His attendants carried no weapons. The branches and green leaves, with which the way was strewed, were emblems of the peaceful thoughts filling the breasts of those who were thus entering the city. It was an eventful hour. That which prompted the popular voice to the expression of devout aspiration and hope, was hidden from the leaders of the people who were only maddened by what they witnessed to a deadlier hate and wrath against Jesus.

3. Jesus was resolved to make his appearance in Jerusalem as the Messiah, and as the Messiah to bear himself there. But it was not enough for his purpose that he should make a solemn entrance into the city. He was now to show by a public and decisive act that he had Messianic prerogatives. And of these he was determined instantly, without regard to consequences, to make use. According to the first three Evangelists the procession moved without any pause of any length to the Temple situated on the road from Jericho.[2] If, as the second Evangelist states, Jesus simply took a view of the Temple,[3] and returned immediately to Bethany, there is a mistake here, we imagine, in the later working up of the narrative, and it was erroneously

[1] Zach. ix. 9.
[2] Mark xi. 11; Matt. xxi. 12; Luke xix. 45.
[3] Mark xi. 11.

thought also that the parable of the fig-tree must come in at this point as an historical fact. Luke mentions a circumstance which happened during the triumphal entry of Jesus into the city of Zion, and which probably gave occasion to the insertion of the parable of the fig-tree in this place. According to Luke, Jesus, notwithstanding the remonstrances of certain Pharisees, not only made no attempt to silence the acclamations of his friends and followers, he gave expression to his deep sorrow that the city of Jerusalem itself did not acknowledge him.[1] For it was, comparatively speaking, only a small portion of the population of the city that took part in the homage which was paid him. The multitude was composed chiefly of Galileans coming to the Feast. Under these circumstances, Jesus saw the near end of the theocracy, and with it the ruin of the splendor, wealth, and all the proud hopes of Jerusalem. He did not conceal the solemnity of the juncture. He did not pass it over in silence. It was now manifest that the people, notwithstanding their overpowering majority, were not in a condition to liberate themselves from the ruling party, and that it was no kingdom of peace and freedom, of righteousness and truth, that they wanted, no religious renovation, no moral cleansing, changing the whole spirit of the nation; they thirsted for power only, and riches and dominion. Although what Jesus said on this occasion is no longer extant in its original connection,[2] yet it is not to be doubted that he foretold the near approach of the overthrow of Jerusalem by the Roman power, and shed bitter tears over the fate of the deluded city

[1] Luke xix. 41.

[2] Luke xix. 43 is an allusion to the impending destruction of Jerusalem not to be mistaken.

of God. Thus, since the nation as such rejected the salvation which Jesus offered them, as he now clearly foresaw that they would, there was nothing left for them in their blind proneness to excitement but to yield themselves up without reserve to the men who were bent upon bringing about a politico-theocratic revolution. That these men were all unable to cope with the mighty power of Rome could not escape the keen vision of Jesus.

But Jesus did not suffer himself to be long delayed by this melancholy mood in accomplishing the main purpose of his entry into the city. He turned first to the Temple, and thither also rolled the tumultuous billows of men. It is inconsistent with the earnestness and purity of his character to imagine that he accepted the shouts of the crowd, the palm branches and garments spread in his way, as his consecration to the office of Messiah. By a Messianic act he desired to accredit himself publicly as the Founder of the true Communion of God, and to announce to the opposing party especially that the kingdom of God stands not in words but in power.

Notwithstanding the zeal of the ruling party for forms, the precincts of the Temple were daily desecrated in the most shameful manner, partly by money-changers who established themselves in the Court of the Gentiles for the purpose of furnishing by exchange the double drachmas required for the payment of the Temple dues, and partly by the tradespeople who offered for sale the animals, frankincense, wine, oil, and whatever a devoted Israelite needed for his religious offerings. Upon entering the outer places of the Temple, Jesus instantly drove away from the precincts of the sanctuary, without parleying with them, these

tradesmen and exchangers and the people who were dealing with them. The overturning of the tables and seats of the exchangers and sellers of doves shows that it was not done without violence, and proves the resistance made by those who were carrying their profane articles to and fro within the Temple.[1] The fourth Gospel states, that, in driving out these tradesmen and their cattle, Jesus made use of a scourge which he made himself of a piece of cord.[2] While this scene of tumult was enacted, the people, as it appears, thronged into the outer courts of the Temple, and Jesus seized the occasion publicly to justify what he was doing by appealing to passages in the prophets.[3] This was unquestionably a very singular act of his. It requires explanation.

If it were, as the fourth Gospel tells us, at the very beginning of his career that Jesus undertook thus to purify the Temple in a way apparently so arbitrary, and in fact almost violent, it would be inexplicable. The whole subsequent tenor of the Evangelical history would in this case be a riddle. There would be no development, no progress to be traced in the consciousness of Jesus. And there would be also the further riddle, why for such a space of time he took such pains to divert public attention from his person, and why he so long delayed the confession of his Messiahship to his disciples. That the fourth Gospel states as having occurred at the beginning of his public life what could have taken place only at the close, only reveals the fact that the fourth Gospel derived its statements chiefly from sources that had their origin

[1] Matt. xi. 16.

[2] John iv. 15. The account in the fourth Gospel bears evident marks of a subsequent amplification.

[3] Is. lvi. 7; Jer. vii. 11.

in Judea. And as the so-called Purification of the Temple was the first act of Jesus in Jerusalem that caused a sensation, the fourth Gospel transfers it to the beginning of his career as the most natural publication of his Messianic office.

But even considered as an act performed towards the close of his public life, it still appears in many respects objectionable. Jesus had come to found a kingdom of the Eternal Spirit, to build a temple of the Spirit, as upon this very occasion he declared.[1] Whence then this flaming zeal for the house of God built of stone? Up to this hour he had avoided every illegal step, the faintest appearance even of any violent proceedings. Why then this sudden, stormy, unhesitating procedure, before making any complaint to the officials who had the Temple in charge? It was not his intention, under any circumstances, to bring the Communion which he was forming in a close relation to the Temple service. He had said most explicitly that the Temple would be destroyed. To what purpose then this attempt to reform the Temple service?

Nothing indeed could be more erroneous than to imagine that Jesus intended by the purification of the outer courts of the Temple to announce himself as the reformer of the Temple service. His design could only have been to express a warning against any further devotion to that service. He sought to set plainly before the multitude that attended him the desecration of the sanctuary by the base love of gain and a traffic doubly improper in that place. He wished to make manifest to them in this fact the ruin of the theocratic power and the approaching abolition of the Temple

[1] Matt. xxvi. 61; John ii. 19.

service, as a fact already at hand. He thus aimed to prove his sacred right to establish the spiritual temple of his Communion in the place of this temple of stone, degraded and desecrated as it was by its own guardians and servants. The very passages of Scripture, to which he referred on this occasion for his justification, authorize such an explanation of this bold deed of Jesus.

In the passage in the book of Isaiah which Jesus quoted,[2] the reference in the original is to the *new* Temple, in which not only the Jews but other nations also will worship the Lord; and in the passage from Jeremiah,[3] the Jews are commanded to amend their ways and their doings before the Lord. Thus in both passages the possible destruction of the old sanctuary is presupposed.

But the sudden and violent purification of the Temple finds its explanation also in the circumstances of the occasion. Upon entering the fore-court of the Temple, Jesus was the more shocked at the profane din that met him there, because it proceeded from people who were trading in things sacred, in things consecrated to his Heavenly Father as sin-offerings and thank-offerings. Thus the Sanctuary itself, otherwise regarded with so much external reverence, hedged round with so many time-honored institutions, had ceased to inspire an ordinary sense of decency! Jesus was doubtless most shocked by the shameless hypocrisy which regarded and treated things holy as the means of gratifying the love of gain. In such circumstances the Temple was no longer the symbol of a reverent fear of God, but the venal resort of base selfishness.

[1] Is. lvi. 7. [2] Jer. vii. 2 *et seq.*

Far from Jesus then was the thought of wishing to stand forth as a zealot for the purity and sanctity of the old Temple service. He performed that bold act simply as the founder of the new spiritual temple of his Communion, for a witness against the old Temple, the ruin of which its own worshippers sealed by their desecration of it. While, regardless of consequences, he punished this desecration, he announced at the same time the new Temple, of which the old Temple was only a type.

The correctness of this view of the incident is corroborated also by what Jesus said upon the occasion, the report of which is best preserved by the second Evangelist.[1] By the temple opened to all nations, he could not possibly have meant the Herodian edifice, he must have intended the Temple of the Messianic Future to which the Gentiles were to be admitted. Thus, since the kingdom of the Eternal Spirit was founded, the sacrificial services and the institution of the priesthood must come to an end. Whither the outward service of the Sanctuary led at last, is shown most manifestly by the fact that, under the pretence of aiding divine worship, the immediate precincts of the Sanctuary had been turned into places of merchandise. Hence when Jesus with a bold hand broke in upon this Godless traffic, the act struck, not only at the abuse which had become connected with the Temple service, but at the Temple worship itself. The words which Jesus addressed to the Jews, as the fourth Gospel has them, "Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will build it up again,"[2] and which were afterwards proved

[1] Mark xi. 17. Mark alone has the words, "Is it not written that my house shall be called a house of prayer *for all nations?*"

[2] John ii. 19.

by witnesses at the trial of Jesus,[1] were really spoken by Jesus, and with a very solemn meaning. As Jesus had, once for all, publicly and solemnly proclaimed himself the Messiah of a spiritual kingdom of God, the theocratic Temple worship ceased to have any intrinsic justification as a means of religious life. Therefore it was that Jesus was first drawn to the Temple to announce the coming end of the Temple worship. Through the act by which the announcement was accompanied, he stamped upon his word the seal of fact.

It is only thus that the reference of Jesus to the prophecy of a future Temple for the nations has an appropriate significance. Only thus is it intelligible why Jesus drove purchasers away from the sacrificial animals exposed for sale, and which were indispensable only so long as the prescribed forms of sacrifice had validity. The saying of Jesus which belongs in this place, namely, that he would build up the ruined Temple in three days, was preserved in the original record used by the fourth Evangelist. But in its original meaning it found no consistent place in the Evangelist's mystical, allegorical modes of thought, and, accordingly, he understands it, wholly without grounds, as referring to the impending crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus. That it should have such a reference is the more unlikely, inasmuch as, if Jesus, when in full sight of the Temple and after driving the traffickers away, spoke of the destruction and restoration of the Temple within three days and meant thereby the destruction and re-animation of his own body, it would have been proposing to his hearers an inexplicable riddle. But he could not have intended at that time to speak in riddles, for it was the hour when a distinct final decision was to be met and made.

[1] Mark xiv. 58; Matt. xxvi. 61.

4. The incident in the Temple was the immediate occasion for the measures that were now taken by the hierarchical party against Jesus. He had not only violently interfered with that authority in the Temple which belonged to the high spiritual dignities alone, and taken upon himself the administration of the police of the Temple, he had distinctly declared and before all the people that he was the Messiah, that the Sanctuary of the nation would be destroyed through his means, and that he would build a new Temple for all the nations of the earth.

That he had set himself up against the law of the fathers, transgressed the sacred ordinances, and put his authority above that of the High Council itself, — these were charges that might now be made good against him without much difficulty. According to the old law he had incurred the penalty of death. And although time had weakened the operation of that law, and in many respects mitigated its execution, yet the present case was of so glaring a character that there might well be the most urgent necessity for making a terrible example. Thus Jesus might be prosecuted for violating the Old Covenant, for disturbing the faith of the people and attempting to set up a new, unlawful religion. Whether it were advisable to prosecute him during the Feast and while he was surrounded by so many of his ardent adherents, whether a popular commotion might not be produced in consequence, and the theocracy itself might fall a sacrifice, were certainly questions to be well considered, and, in case Jesus designed to establish a temporal kingdom of the Messiah, questions full of danger.

Jesus himself was not in the slightest degree insensible to the consequences of his recent acts and declara-

tions. He knew that his hour was at hand, and that he had come under the condemnation of the obsolete Letter. He knew that his enemies, if their authority were to be saved from a speedy end, were bound to use all the means in their power to put a stop to the moral, spiritual, and religious reformation going forth from him and daily becoming more extensive. With all the composure and clearness of mind that characterize the saintly hero standing at the height of his great work, he went to meet his coming fate. And this fate was not now to be long delayed.[1]

NOTE.

[THERE is more light yet to break upon this part of the history, which relates the particulars of the final visit paid by Jesus to Jerusalem. I am inclined to think that Jesus went, as Paul went, after him, to Jerusalem, "bound in the spirit." The busy machinations of his enemies, their opposition to him steadily increasing in strength and fierceness, satisfied him that his opportunities of publishing the truth and awakening the minds of his countrymen to it were now numbered. He felt bound to avail himself of the occasion offered him by the occurrence of the great National Festival, which drew such multitudes together in the city; and he resolved to make himself and his cause as widely known as possible. At first upon approaching the capital he used great caution, and withdrew from the plots and snares of the opposition, but as the Feast drew nigh, and the crowds of pilgrims increased, he felt less the necessity of being upon his guard. And the feeling was justified. His popularity was so great, that all idea of publicly arresting him was given up by the ecclesiastical authorities. They did not venture to lay violent hands upon him in the presence of the people. But they felt all the more urgently the need there was of putting a stop to his career. They would

[1] Upon these views of ours, see App., Ill. 24, p. 170.

have cared little for anything he might have said, or any pretensions he might have made, had it not been for the immense popular influence he was gaining, an influence which threatened their ascendency. There was nothing treasonable in the raising of Lazarus, nothing seditious in the act itself. It was not the fact, but the effect it was having, that gave increased force to the opposition. I cannot perceive that there is any inconsistency in this particular between the fourth Gospel and the other three Gospels. Nor do I see any reason why, even if the resurrection of Lazarus had the effect of bringing the measures of the priests against Jesus to a head, they should have made this act a special ground of accusation against him. There was a careful avoidance, on the part of his accusers, of any such specific modes of proceeding. They did not make his purification of the Temple a formal charge against him. Dr. Schenkel represents Jesus as intending his public and solemn entry into Jerusalem as a proclamation of his office as the Messiah. That it was regarded by his enemies as involving this pretension, I have no doubt. But it appears to me he had a grander aim, a more simple comprehensive moral and religious purpose. Our author seems to think also, that if we credit the fourth Gospel, we must suppose that Jesus made his public entry into the city for the express purpose of glorifying the great miracle, which he had wrought at Bethany. But I can find nothing in the fourth Gospel to warrant the supposition. The fourth Gospel tells us only of the effect which that extraordinary event had upon the enemies of Jesus, whom it so infuriated that they would gladly have put Lazarus out of the way also, and upon the people who had heard of that great wonder, and who, Dr. Schenkel thinks, should have hailed Jesus as the Awakener of the dead, which by no means follows. The highest possible dignity was accorded him when he was welcomed as the restorer of the kingdom of David. That included everything else.

That the resurrection of Lazarus is not mentioned in the first three Gospels, that they do not appear to have had any knowledge of it, is, it must be admitted, very remarkable and not easily to be accounted for. Nevertheless, the omission may be safely left unexplained, if the narrative of the event in the fourth Gospel bears intrinsic marks of truth, as it certainly does in its wonderful and undesigned fidelity to the characters of Martha and Mary, and most especially to the character of Jesus himself.

I must confess that the explanation given in the foregoing chapter of the Purification of the Temple by Jesus, so far from being satisfactory, I cannot clearly understand. It strikes me as altogether too ingenious; and it represents the act as done quite too much for effect. Unquestionably, if Jesus regarded the Temple as "a house of prayer for all nations," the shock it must have given him at seeing it so grossly desecrated suffices to account for his instantly and instinctively insisting that the desecration should cease, that the trades-people should leave the sacred places without delay. It is not necessary to suppose that he himself used any violence. He had a great crowd of people with him, and his first word condemnatory of the sacrilege must have struck a chord in the popular feeling which instantly responded. The exchangers and traders, panic-struck, precipitately retreated, not so much before one man, as before the populace. It is not necessary to suppose that they made any resistance. They knew that they were in the wrong, and the haste with which they fled accounts for the upsetting of the tables and seats. It is true, the history states that Jesus made for himself a scourge to drive the traffickers from the precincts of the sanctuary. This looks at first sight like deliberation. But it may be an indication of the very opposite. There were animals herded there for sale, sheep and oxen. And the scourge of small cords which Jesus had, may have been nothing more than a piece of cord which he found lying there and which he folded up for the purpose of driving the animals away. At all events, it is not to be supposed that his will, backed as it was by the people, met with the slightest resistance, or that any occasion was given for so vigorous an application of the scourge as we have seen represented in an old picture of the scene.

It is not likely that this event occurred twice; and how that should have been done, as the fourth Gospel states, at the commencement of his public life, which the other Gospels represent as done towards its close, I cannot tell. There is no better explanation of it than our author has given. — TRANS.]

CHAPTER XXI.

THE OLD STATE AND THE NEW.

1. The ruling party did not venture to lay hands on Jesus immediately. They had as much as decided to prosecute him, but they desired to be sure of the result. That Jesus again appeared the very next day in the Temple is a proof of the indomitable fearlessness with which in these last days he advanced to confront the threatening danger. A deputation of the Sanhedrim, as it appears, was commissioned to demand of him his authority for interfering with the police of the Temple. He was questioned as to his right to do things of this kind.[1] He must now show whether he recognized the established authorities in opposition to his office as the Messiah, and whether he would declare himself accordingly as the founder of a new moral and religious order of things.

It may seem remarkable that, after his solemn entry into Jerusalem and that bold exercise of authority in the Temple, Jesus appears to have hesitated to designate himself as the Messiah to the officers of the law.[2] But it was not in order that he might continue any longer unrecognized as the Messiah, but because he held it inconsistent with his personal dignity voluntarily to furnish his enemies with the means of prosecuting him, that he returned an evasive answer. Besides, was he not justified in questioning them before he answered them? And did not their refusal to reply

[1] Mark xi. 27; Matt. xxi. 23; Luke xx. 2.
[2] Mark xi. 29; Matt. xxi. 24; Luke xx. 3.

to his question further justify him in refusing to reply to them? He considered it right, moreover, to let the deputies of the hierarchical party know that he saw clearly through their plans and purposes. His questioning of these emissaries consisted in the relation of two parables, both of which are given us by the first Evangelist, while only one of them is found in the second and third Gospels. By the first, the parable of the two sons, he set before his questioners the hypocrisy and false-heartedness which they had shown towards John the Baptist, and which they were now showing towards him. While the "publicans and harlots," the classes the most degraded morally, had at least submitted to the reproof of John and been converted by him from their evil ways, they, the representatives of the traditional religion, the upholders of the national power, had only hardened themselves still more against the preaching of that teacher of righteousness; and, if they had not taken part against John, but even spoken well of him, it was not from any real feeling of respect for that earnest, moral instructor, but only because they feared the loss of their popularity.[1] Jesus therefore now told them in so many words that the kingdom would be taken from them and given to the "Sinners." They were like the son who promised to go and work and nevertheless did nothing.[2] Still more pointedly did Jesus describe the character of his opposers in the parable of the unfaithful laborers in the vineyard.

In this parable the Jewish people are compared, as they often are in the ancient Scriptures, to a vineyard. In the times of the Old Covenant the Lord had sent the prophets as his laborers into the vineyard. A fine

[1] Mark xi. 33; Matt. xxi. 26; Luke xx. 6. [2] Matt. xxi. 30.

allusion this of Jesus to the fact that the priests and kings, generally speaking, had not fulfilled their duty to God. The prophets, on the contrary, had fallen a sacrifice to the ill-treatment received at the hands of the tools of the theocracy, the kings and priests. In this parable Jesus distinguishes himself most distinctly as the "heir," the Messiah, from the Old Testament prophets, who are only the servants, the laborers. He tells his opposers to their faces that he knows their designs upon his life; he admits also that they will succeed in executing their deadly purpose. How significant the designation of himself as the "heir," the inheritor of the spiritual estate of the Old Testament.[1] The heir was not bound to administer the estate in the old way, least of all when it was proved to have wasted it. But he would transfigure the letter of the Old Testament spiritually, transmute the written word into life. In order to do this, however, he must die. The hierarchy would tolerate no transfiguration of the law, no conquest of the spirit over the letter, of freedom over spiritual bondage. In order to prevent what Jesus aimed at, the men of the letter were resolved to be his murderers. They had to resort to this extreme measure, not from a cruel pleasure in blood, not even from any personal feeling of revenge, but from hierarchical fanaticism. They saw threatened by Jesus the institutions which secured to them honor, power, distinction. And from their narrow point of view they held that the welfare of the nation was identified with the undisputed continuance of those institutions.

No desire for a personal triumph over his foes awoke in the bosom of Jesus at that hour. The purest spirit of submission, devoid of every thought of self, to the

[1] Mark xii. 7.

fearful fate awaiting him speaks in every word that falls from his lips. The present belongs to his enemies, the future to him. He carried in his heart the conviction, which nothing could disturb, that the day of the religion of the Law was past, that Jerusalem was about to lose forever its high position as the centre of revealed religion among the nations. The declaration that the vineyard would be given to others,[1] contains the prophetic truth that the populations, descendants of Japheth, were thenceforth to lead all progress, moral and religious, social and civil. These, as the upholders of a living faith in God and a reformed morality, were now to be accounted, in the eyes of God, the true Israel.[2]

2. The effect which these denunciations produced upon the powerful enemies of Jesus, bent upon bringing him to trial, may easily be imagined. As, by the incident in the Temple, he had placed himself in opposition to the theocratic form of worship, so by these declarations he took the same attitude towards the theocratic Constitution, in fact, to the whole theocratic nation, so far as it had shown itself determined to unite its fate with that of its leaders. This assault struck to the heart, inflicting a deadly wound, those at whom it was aimed. The "high-priests and scribes," the men of the reigning theological schools and the possessors of the spiritual power, were painted in colors not to be mistaken as enemies of God, of his ambassadors, and, in fact, of his own Son. They were represented as the murderers of the new life which God sought to communicate to his people. The conflict between Jesus and the hierarchical party was thus pronounced by Jesus himself a conflict for life or death.

[1] Mark xii. 9; Luke xx. 16; Matt. xxi. 41, with a later addition.
[2] Ps. cxviii. 22.

Under these circumstances there remained nothing for the hierarchy but to hasten as quickly as possible the arrest of Jesus. After such deadly attacks it must have appeared extremely perilous to suffer this man to go at liberty any longer and to allow him free speech. From its own point of view the ruling party was not in the wrong. According to the civil usages of modern times such bold proceedings as those of Jesus would certainly not have been endured so long. It was only the force of popular feeling that held back the authorities from arresting Jesus instantly. They feared the "people," the "multitude."[1]

This fear may seem surprising, since the Pharisaic party, on account of their nationality, had the voice of the people in their favor. But the last imposing appearance of Jesus in Jerusalem, his bold declaration that he was, in a wholly new sense of the word, the Messiah, his equally bold action against the disorder in the Temple, his large and free views of a new spiritual sanctuary, open to all nations, the holy courage, the God-inspired intrepidity which he manifested in all that he said and did, the willingness to suffer and to sacrifice himself, which his bitterest enemies scarcely ventured to question, in a word, his singular and incomparable personal force, — had already won the favor, if not of the larger, yet of the better part of the population of Jerusalem. Numerous adherents of his had arrived from Galilee, Perea, Judea. Troops of ardent friends and sympathizers in his work surrounded him. The eyes of not a few were opened to the delusion into which the hierarchical party had lulled them and others. The arrest of Jesus in the excitement of the festal week might be attended with dangerous con-

[1] Mark xii. 12; Luke xx. 19; Matt. xxi. 46.

sequences. New attempts therefore must be made in order to secure a safe point of attack against Jesus, and to justify the seizure of his person, to some extent at least, in the eyes of those who were well-disposed towards him.

3. According to the second Evangelist such an attempt first proceeded from the high ecclesiastical authorities.[1] After the entry of Jesus into Jerusalem it was no longer mere party intrigues that availed. Official steps were taken against him, by which his ruin was to be effected as speedily as possible. The High Council felt themselves moved, on account of the national repute of Jesus, to strengthen themselves by calling to their side adherents of the Pharisaic schools and members of the party of the Herodians, in order by their help to obtain the strongest proofs possible against him. They had sufficient grounds of complaint for a religious prosecution. But it was very doubtful whether the charge of creating a religious disturbance would have any weight with the civil magistrate, by whom a sentence of death must be ratified. Hence arose the necessity of bringing the political character of Jesus under suspicion and of branding him, if possible, as an enemy to the Roman rule. This task was undertaken by a deputation of Pharisees and Herodians.[2] They went bending before him with flattering expressions about his fearless love of truth. In order to put him off his guard, they bore honorable testimony to his disregard of the distinctions of rank and to his teaching "the way of God," i. e. the way well-pleasing to God, in unvarnished truth. By paying him this personal tribute, they hoped to draw from him

[1] Mark xii. 13; xi. 27.

[2] Mark xii. 13; Matt. xxii. 15; Luke xx. 20.

his most private thoughts as to his position towards the civil power, and his designs in reference to the Roman authority. Now there was a question that might be honestly answered in very different ways, — the question concerning the duty of paying the taxes imposed by the Roman government, regarded from the point of view of the theocratic order of things. The Roman power was certainly a usurpation. The true Jew recognized no sovereign but the Lord of heaven and earth. And as Jesus had distinctly declared it to be his great work to establish a heavenly kingdom, must it not have appeared a logical consequence that he released his followers from the obligation of paying taxes to an earthly kingdom? The deputation, therefore, with well-meditated cunning, put the question to him, whether the Roman emperor were authorized to lay taxes on the Jews, and whether the Jews were bound to pay the tribute imposed by him? They had reckoned with confidence upon his declaring from his point of view that the tribute ought not to be paid. This calculation showed that they had a very imperfect idea of the work and aim of Jesus. They would hardly have put this cunning question to him, had they not really suspected him of secret designs against the Roman supremacy. It was doubtless their belief that he was probably intending to strike a blow at the governing powers in Judea, and to raise himself to the command, spiritual and temporal, of the Israelitish people.

The farther he was from having given any intimation, either in word or deed, of such a purpose, the more they desired to make it certain that this was his design, and so to prevent the meditated blow against the existing order. Only let it appear that in re-

ligious matters he was an audacious and incorrigible transgressor of the laws of the fathers, and at the same time a daring and violent conspirator against the civil order, then his death could alone expiate his wickedness, and his condemnation by the Roman Procurator might be confidently anticipated.

But these crafty plotters found themselves balked in their expectations. The answer that Jesus returned to their question bears witness, not only to his admirable presence of mind and his imperturbable wisdom, but, we may add, to his lofty humor. It states, moreover, in the simplest terms, a principle perfectly suited to adjust the relations of religion and the State at all times. Religion and the State, as he declares, have each its peculiar sphere which must not be confounded the one with the other. He utters an emphatic warning against everything of the kind. He bids his questioners render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's.[1] A charge, to which the Jewish hierarchy was open, was that they had mixed together things that are to be treated as essentially distinct. Their kings had seized and appropriated to themselves priestly prerogatives, their priesthood had striven for royal dignity and power. It was the express design of the kingdom of heaven, founded by Jesus, to make a thorough end of this mingling of Church and State. The design of Jesus undoubtedly was to secure for his kingdom, the "Communion" of believers, a position wholly independent of the offices and interests of the State. Nothing was further from him than the idea of establishing a religious association to be ruled or led by the State, a so-called "State Church." He did not indeed regard the State as an

[1] Mark xii. 27; Matt. xxii. 21; Luke xx. 25.

institution to which religion was indifferent. He had the greatest respect for its rights and its dignity. But the State is to the kingdom of God as the particular to the universal. In his kingdom, Jesus comprehended whatever in human life tended to a higher order of things, an order established under the authority of God himself and of his spirit. In this Communion, the State could find its place only as a member and instrument of the great whole. But the State as such was not by any means an immediate object with Jesus. It was in the moral and religious sphere, the sphere of the conscience, which is essentially wholly free and universal that his work exclusively lay. The sphere of the State, on the other hand, is external and restricted to the limits of legal force and national conditions. The question concerning the tribute, which gave opportunity to Jesus to declare what the relation is between religion and the State, was the very question to place the fundamental difference between the two in the clearest light.

The State cannot in the nature of the case treat taxes as a voluntary matter, depending, whether they be paid or not, upon the pleasure of individuals. In case of refusal to pay them, the State must resort to force. But force is entirely excluded from the conditions of life in the kingdom of God. Here, only voluntary performance has worth and weight; and whatever is done for the divine Cause unwillingly, without truth and love in the heart, is before God as though it were not done; done hypocritically, it is an abomination in his sight.

Render to Cæsar what is Cæsar's, and to God what is God's, says Jesus. In other words, the question of the tax has, in itself, nothing to do with the kingdom

of God. It is an affair of the State, and the lawfulness of a tax is not to be disputed upon religious, but only upon legal and political grounds.

That the deputies of the High Council were filled with surprise and chagrin at the reply of Jesus, we can imagine. They had failed in their purpose. For the declaration of Jesus was not only a direct one, it contained also an indirect summons to fulfil their duties to the State, i. e. to the Roman Government, conscientiously. The vital sense of the words of Jesus the deputation did not apprehend. A religious Association without the power to use force and inflict punishment must have seemed to them, from their point of view, an impossible thing. The Old Testament order of things was in itself in a certain sense a State institution. Obedience to its laws was exacted by force, and disobedience punished most severely. Jesus himself was to answer with his life for his departure from the traditional order. The idea of freedom of conscience and faith, which was the starting-point of all the labors of Jesus, was a rock of offence and a scandal to the Jewish hierarchy. A religion that allowed every one to believe according to his spiritual needs, was not possible in their eyes. The deputation retired dissatisfied with themselves, because they had not gained their purpose, but strengthened more than ever in the belief that Jesus was a dangerous innovator, an enemy to the laws and ordinances received from the fathers, an element of disturbance and agitation, to whose influence a check must be put as speedily as possible.

4. And now all the powerful Jewish parties were united against Jesus. His enemies were from the higher classes, his friends were from the people. His appearance in the Temple, and his explicit claim to be

the Messiah, rendered him the object of distrust and of a persecution to which all the possessors of power consented. Even members of the Sadducean school crowded around him to play off upon him their contempt, which was without reason or sense. In their opinion, probably his Messianic pretensions were more matters of ridicule than alarm. The Sadducees, who rejected the austerity, the literal faith, and the zeal for tradition which distinguished the Pharisees, ought to have appreciated in Jesus the freedom of mind which their notions favored. But cold, haughty, indifferent to the eternal truths of Religion, they disliked his earnestness and his interest in humanity. And the more boldly and unhesitatingly he bore himself, the more they despised him as a fanatic. The doctrine that Jesus taught of the resurrection, they ridiculed in its relation to the Mosaic Law,[1] by which, when the husband died leaving no children, his brother was bound to marry the widow. But Jesus silenced them by giving them to understand that he did not share in the material ideas of the resurrection entertained by the Pharisees; and in reply to the foolish and frivolous inference of the Sadducees, that, if seven brothers should one after another marry one woman without issue, it would be doubtful whose wife she would be in the resurrection, Jesus shows on his part a highly spiritual conception of our continued personal existence in a higher state of being after death. The relations of sex then cease, and man then has such a mode of being as suits his spiritual destiny. The essence of the doctrine set forth by Jesus concerning the resurrection lies, however, in the idea that the personal life created by God, carries in itself a source of imperish-

[1] Deut. xxv. 5.

able existence, because it is made after the likeness of God. Consequently, according to the testimony of Jesus, faith in immortality rests on faith in the living, original, and indissoluble communion of man with God. It belongs to the character of the living God, that he is not a God of the dead, but a God eternally "living."[1]

The prosecution of Jesus was, as we know, already determined upon by the hierarchical party; but the last attempts to entangle him in the snares that were set for him were completely frustrated. The endeavor to find grounds for accusing him of cherishing designs dangerous to the State, had especially proved unsuccessful. The hierarchical party could not but suppose that he had such designs. It was not in their power to conceive of the Messiah otherwise than in connection with revolutionary attempts and an insurrection of the people against the government of Rome. The pacific character, therefore, in which Jesus appeared they could consider only the hypocritical mask of a demagogue. They deceived themselves. They blindly judged him by their own standard. Jesus died with the pure consciousness of having labored only for the eternal kingdom of the spirit. They perished in the struggle for worldly power. He demanded for his Communion simply free space, free air, untrammelled motion, a position independent of the State. He never expected nor desired the supporters of the State to support or promote his Cause directly or indirectly. He had entered into no alliance with the Roman Procurator, made no effort to win Herod Antipas to his views. Taking this position, independent of all public authority, he advanced immeasurably beyond the the-

[1] Mark xii. 18; Matt. xxii. 23; Luke xx. 27.

ocratic stand-point. And while he separated religion from politics, and labored for the former without the co-operation of the latter, he has established freedom of conscience, and made religious conviction independent of the civil power for all time. In the view of the theocracy, religion is the offspring of royal authority invested by God with supernatural powers. Such was the idea of the opposers of Jesus. In his view, religion is the offspring of the conscience, self-dependent, and owning no obligation, but to the immediate source of all truth and love, to God and His revelations. No charge was more specious, than that Jesus cherished political designs, none in reality was more unjust. But there has certainly proceeded from him the idea of an entirely new relation of the civil order to religious conviction, of the State to the Church.

NOTE.

[The strong terms in which both M. Renan and Dr. Schenkel express their admiration of the memorable saying of Jesus: "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's," lead us to suppose that they consider it as affording us an insight, which we should otherwise lack, into the views of Jesus in regard to the relation of religion to the State. But were it indeed so, were it the only thing in his history which shows us his position in this respect, should we not be forced to conclude that he held the respective spheres of politics and religion as entirely distinct, mutually excluding each other? Whereas, the whole tenor of the instructions of Jesus teaches us that his idea of religion embraces all the spheres and relations of life, our social relations most manifestly. And what are the terms *civil* and *political*, but other names for a certain class of our social relations? And what influence of the teachings of Jesus is more marked even to this hour, than the effect which they have upon

political arrangements and institutions? Jesus recognized no ground as neutral where there was "stuff for the conscience," nor in deference to any social organization did he compromise truth and right. His commandments were to be obeyed, although princes and magistrates should forbid. But herein was the divine peculiarity of his teaching, that he forbade all resort to force on the part of those who undertook to follow his instructions. They were to suffer violence to the uttermost, but never lift a finger to inflict it. Consequently, however his truth and his followers might come in collision with the political order of society, no disorganizing and destructive consequences could ensue by their agency. For no such consequences could they be held responsible, ready as they were to bear patiently all injuries and to return good for evil. Their triumphs must needs be moral, pacific, and gradual.

And now as to this celebrated saying of Jesus: "Render unto Cæsar," &c., I must confess my inability to appreciate any of the explanations that are given of it. I cannot for a moment suppose that Jesus here gives authority for the withdrawal of the political relations of life from the jurisdiction of conscience and religion. That this saying, thus understood, should find favor with all such as are disposed to support existing forms of government, however flagrant as usurpations, however despotically administered, I can easily see. But how, in what sense, it is to be accepted in a country representing the pre-eminently Christian idea of Freedom, under a government of laws which every individual has a responsible share in making, and upon which the virtue and well-being of the whole depend, I am not able to perceive. Certain it is, that this saying had its effect upon the occasion on which it was uttered. It baffled those conspirators, and they had not a word to say. Certain it is also, that the occasion was not one upon which Jesus could have felt himself moved to enunciate a great principle, for in those to whom he spoke there was no openness of mind to receive it. He would not cast his pearls before swine. The question that was put to him as to the lawfulness of paying tribute to the Roman emperor was not put in good faith. To the keen eye of Jesus, the sinister design was transparent; and disgusted, outraged as he was at the hypocritical terms of respect in which these persons addressed him, he could have had no thought but of balking their malice, and silencing and warning them. "Show me a piece of your money," he said. They produced a piece of money. "Whose image and

superscription does it bear?" he asked. "Cæsar's," was the reply. "Very well then, you are making use of what is Cæsar's, let Cæsar have what is his, and see to it (and may not this be the point of his words?) that you give unto God what belongs to God." This question of the tribute he regarded as trifling, in respect of its lawfulness in comparison with the far more vital respects in which they were disobeying God without scruple. — TRANS.]

CHAPTER XXII.

THE WOE PRONOUNCED UPON THE HIERARCHICAL PARTY.

1. THERE was still one point upon which the enemies of Jesus might hope to find a sure ground of complaint upon a political account. At an earlier period he had taken the title of "Son of Man," but he had since laid claim to the dignity of "Son of God." Let decisive evidence of the fact be adduced, and it would not be difficult to show that he had violated the first commandment of the Decalogue, that he had assumed without qualification divine honors, that he was thus guilty of blaspheming the divine Name, and had moreover expressed the desire to take possession, like a new David, of the Messianic throne. A Jewish theologue, as it appears, was sent to him to ascertain his ideas in relation to the first commandment.[1] In answer to the question, which is the first commandment, if Jesus should allow it to appear that he claimed divine authority for himself, i. e. should he declare himself against the one only unrivalled sovereignty of God over all created existences, then it would no longer be difficult to hand him over to the law as a blasphemer

[1] Mark xii. 28; Matt. xxii. 34.

of the supreme majesty of heaven, and to charge him also, as a necessary consequence of such arrogance, with a design to secure earthly power and supremacy also. But Jesus in his reply made not the slightest allusion that could offend the ear of the strictest zealot of the Old Testament doctrine concerning God. He made bold, indeed, to distinguish one commandment above the rest, considering the fact that the law of the Ten Commandments forms an inseparable whole, and therefore there could be no discussion as to the greater or less worth of its particular precepts. For making this distinction he appealed to several passages of the Law itself.[1] And while he placed the law of love to one's neighbor by the side of the law commanding love to God, he pronounced the former to be just as important as the latter, and both together he declared to be the most important of all.[2] He thus not only showed that there was not a shadow of authority for accusing him of destroying faith in the unity and sovereignty of God; he emphasized the unity and sovereignty of God in the most pointed manner, and repelled most forcibly the suspicion that he claimed divine honors for himself.[3] This explicit declaration confounded his questioner, who, evidently taken by surprise, exclaimed, "Right! Master, thou hast spoken according to the truth," (but not as I expected,) "there is only one God and beside him there is no other." The charge, circulated against Jesus that he assumed the honor that belonged only to God, claiming a divine dignity for himself and destroying the divine unity, was thus shown to be calumnious. Instead of at all

[1] Deut. vi. 4.; Levit. xix. 18.

[2] Mark xii. 31; Matt. xxii. 39.

[3] Mark xii. 29, which gives us the original declaration of Jesus, entirely in the spirit of the Old Testament monotheism.

derogating from the doctrine of one Supreme God he had given new life to it in the moral and religious consciousness of the soul. The scribe showed that he was no incorrigible partisan. He was open to better thoughts. The snare laid for Jesus had failed, and the man was forced to return to his employers and report its failure. But so far from suffering any chagrin he was rejoiced rather at discovering that Jesus was a different person from what he had looked for; and therefore Jesus could testify that the scribe was not far from him, not far from the kingdom of God.[1] (*a*)

2. This conversation throws a significant light upon the character of Jesus as it plainly shows that, notwithstanding his office as Messiah and his dignity as "Son of God," he did not claim for himself a divine nature, or divine attributes. He considered his Messianic office and authority as entirely consistent with a human personality. But in this understanding of his Messiahship, the hierarchical party were utterly unable to recognize him in that office. The Founder of a Communion of the spirit and of faith was the most dangerous opponent of the theocratic system. Hence that party had double reason for rendering Jesus as harmless as possible. The bare fact that he had declared the founder of such a communion the Messiah, had not without reason caused the greatest uneasiness and excitement among all the friends of the established religion of the letter, and fully strengthened them in the determination to prosecute Jesus. From their point of view they could not regard him as the Messiah. He appeared to them to be deceiving himself and others. He was a *deceiver*. A word was now found to inflame the people. And no effort must be

[1] Mark xii. 34.

omitted to show by facts the utter unlawfulness of the Messianic pretensions of Jesus.

According to the traditions of the letter, the Messiah was to be a direct descendant of David himself. How now if it were demonstrable that Jesus stood in not the remotest relation to the royal house of David?

In truth, Jesus the Nazarene, the carpenter's son, had never been supposed to belong to the family of David. Although upon his entry into Jerusalem he was hailed as the "Son of David,"[1] yet this title had reference, not to his natural descent, but to his Messianic kingship, which was already understood among his disciples in its moral and spiritual sense. The genealogies, that were made up several decades after his disappearance to accredit him to the Jews as the Messiah, contain the most striking proof of the difficulty of authenticating his descent from David.

As this most essential mark of the Messiah was wanting in him, the hierarchical party industriously spread everywhere the idea that he had deceitfully announced himself to be that personage. Had Jesus himself believed in his royal descent, he would now have had the most urgent occasion to make good this claim and prove it by all the means and evidences in his power. He did not do so. On the contrary, he proved that the hope of a Messiah descending from David was visionary.

This truth he set forth in a very peculiar manner from Psalm cx. In this psalm, of which David was erroneously supposed at that time to be the author, God commands the Lord of the Psalmist, i. e.

[1] This form of salutation is not found in Mark and Luke, but only in Matthew (xxi. 9). It is wanting also in the fourth Gospel. See Mark xi. 9; Luke xix. 37. [This title was applied to Jesus on other occasions. See Matth. xii. 23, Luke xviii. 38. — Trans.]

the theocratic king to sit on his right hand. Upon the supposition that by that king was understood the Messiah, David had designated the Messiah as *his* Lord. But if David considered the Messiah as his Lord, it is manifest that he could not have expected him to arise among his sons or posterity. That the father should call his "son" his Lord is altogether repugnant to the consideration paid in the Old Testament to the filial feeling. The father, David, continued always to be greater and more glorious than any son of his. Hence Jesus rejected the popular opinion that the Messiah must be a descendant of David.

In fact, he could not more directly and powerfully oppose the worldly hopes of the Messiah, with which the hierarchical party were filled, than by combating as he did the idea that the Messiah, in the new sense in which he claimed to be that personage, must descend from David. It is a great error, therefore, to suppose that Jesus appealed to the passage in the Psalms to prove his descent from David, and thus to establish his Messiahship.[1] He did no such thing then or ever.

It was the faith of his followers in his Messianic office that begot the faith in his descent from David. The Jews, even the most pious of that day, could not conceive of the Messiah otherwise than as decorated with the badge of that high lineage. But Jesus combated this notion, and sought, although without success, to liberate his followers from this superstition in regard to his origin. As the Founder of the kingdom of God, as the God-commissioned king of truth, of

[1] Mark xii. 35; Matt. xxii. 41; Luke xx. 41; and Appendix, III. 25, p. 191.

righteousness, of love and peace, he felt, in relation to a crowned prince like David, as a Lord incomparably higher and more glorious. How could he have needed evidence from the genealogical tree of David to accredit him as the Messiah, when he was David's lord by the native royalty and moral greatness of his character shown by a hundred well-known facts.

3. From the height of his consciousness as the Messiah, Jesus had publicly and distinctly named himself the "Son of God." There is nothing in the first three Gospels that authorizes the idea that he assumed this title in any sense essentially different from that in which the people of Israel, or the theocratic king, was called the "Son of God." And even the fourth Gospel furnishes unmistakable evidence that Jesus, during his last sojourn in Jerusalem, connected with his position as Son of God no claim to be a superhuman, divine person. In those stirring days, in the increasing public excitement, the "Jews" demanded of him a direct declaration whether or not he were the Messiah.[1] The fourth Gospel agrees accordingly with the first three Gospels in giving us to understand that the earlier declarations of Jesus in regard to his Messiahship were not sufficiently plain and satisfactory to those at least who stood at a distance from him. In reply to the demand that he would declare himself, he appealed to the works which he had done in the name of his Heavenly Father, as the only sufficient testimony to his Messianic character. The excitement against him appears at that time to have risen to the highest

[1] John x. 22. The fourth Gospel certainly misplaces this scene in referring it to the Feast of Dedication. As Jesus could have been in Jerusalem, during the time of a feast, only at the last Passover, the event related must fall in the time of the last abode of Jesus in the capital.

pitch because he spoke of himself as "one with the Father," [1] although, to prevent all possible misunderstanding, he had previously said that the Father is greater than all,[2] and, at another time, that the Father was greater than he.[3] It had before been objected to him that, although a man, he made himself God, and was of course guilty of blasphemy, and this objection was repeated. The way in which, according to the fourth Gospel, Jesus defended himself against the charge of blasphemy is very remarkable. He made no allusion to his essential equality and unity with God. But he sustains himself by a passage from the Psalms,[4] in which, according to his own understanding of it, mortal men, unjust judges probably, are addressed as "gods," and he thence infers that if this lofty title is given in the Holy Scriptures to unjust judges, surely with far better right may he call himself the "Son of God." It is from such passages in the fourth Gospel that a light, genuinely historical, is poured upon his own representations of his Messiahship. It was not in a philosophical theory concerning his superhuman nature, but in the inmost experience of his personality, pure and single, that the consciousness of his Messianic office and also of his divine sonship had its living root. There was dwelling in him, born of his daily experience, the certainty of being in personal possession of a life far higher and more abounding in the life of God, than all the religious institutions of his country and his time could offer to the longing imagination of man. An unsealed fountain of inspiration, refreshment, consolation, and cleansing was gushing from divine deeps in his heart. He

[1] John x. 30.
[2] John x. 29.
[3] John xiv. 28.
[4] Ps. lxxxii. 6.

had attained to a certainty, not to be shaken, of being in direct and inscrutable spiritual union with God. If Israel, according to the testimony of the Holy Scriptures, was the "Son of God," if the better theocratic kings were so styled, was he not the best accredited representative of his nation, the culmination of the extinct kingship in unapproachable perfection? Did not the title of "Son of God" belong to him in its fullest sense? How could he have any doubt that the moral and religious regeneration of his country depended upon him? Already he felt himself to be the head of the new Israel, the deliverer, the redeemer of all nations, the Saviour of the world, the Resurrection and the Life of mankind.[1]

The appeal to the genealogical tree of David was an appeal to external and human testimony. But it was in this relation that he had said that he received not testimony from men,[2] and he referred, on the other hand, to his works, to the testimony of God living and working in him.

Thus, then, the fourth Gospel, upon close examination, knows nothing of a dignity in Jesus equal with God's, nothing of a peculiarity in his person that would have rendered him the eternal, creative source, the absolute cause of his own acts and successes. His Father in heaven it was from whom all power flowed into him. Of himself the Son was able to do nothing. The Son thus appears beyond all mistake in his relation to the Father as a willing and docile pupil.[3] And although the Father has delivered judgment to the Son, it is still only a charge which the Son has received from the Father and not an indwelling power peculiar to himself. Man is indeed to honor the

[1] John xi. 25. [2] John v. 34. [3] John v. 19.

Son, but not as an original possessor of divine perfections, but as a messenger of God; and messengers of God, executors of the Divine will, fulfilling his holy counsels, were the prophets also. It belongs, above all things, to the nature of God that His will is primal, independent, ruling the whole creation, its intelligences and its laws. Had the fourth Gospel intended to represent Jesus as equal in his nature to God, it would have been bound to ascribe to him a will, underived, causative, and unconditioned. So far from this is the case, that Jesus, in this Gospel, expressly declares that he renounces his own will, and that his sole aim is to do the will of God his Father.[1] Therefore he says, also, that he came not in his own name. He seeks only to be a faithful instrument of his Heavenly Father.[2] He relies upon the aid of the Father. He rejoices in the consciousness that the Father is with him, that He has not left him alone. But this consciousness does not come from the idea of a unity of nature with the Father, but it springs from the conviction that he is ever doing what pleases the Father.[3]

4. At the first, Jesus simply defended himself against the assaults of the hierarchical party. But the knowledge which he obtained at a later period of their deadly designs released him from all reserve. From the deprecatory position which he had maintained until now he changed to an attitude of open and vehement attack. No ebullition of passion, no momentary excitement, moved him thereto. With the calmest conviction, with entire presence of mind, he rose against his foes. He desired now that the final decision might be speedily made. Convinced that they were not to be turned from their purpose, that his

[1] John v. 30. [2] John v. 43. [3] John viii. 29.

death was the necessary condition of his triumph, he could desire nothing else. By a public attack upon the leaders of the hierarchical party, the mortal opposition in which he stood to them would be manifest to all. Every man would then see that he must take one side or the other. The party itself could no longer delay the execution of its resolves. The end must come. The first three Gospels have handed down to us the discourse in which Jesus advanced to a public attack upon the opposing party. Only two of them have fitly interwoven it into the history of coincident events. But, while the second Evangelist, conformably to his custom of avoiding the introduction of discourses of any length, gives us only a brief, significant abstract,[1] the first Evangelist, on the other hand, contains a discourse of great length, and elaborated with so much art that it may be safely assumed that it could not have been delivered by Jesus in this extended shape upon any slight and incidental occasion.[2] The third Evangelist has preserved the keen points of the discourse more fully than the second, but in an erroneous connection.[3] With all these differences, however, we gather from the reports of the three Evangelists, substantially agreeing as they do, that the opposition of Jesus to the theocratic party, which now at the close of his career was marked by a searching severity, was not essentially of a theological, but of a moral and religious nature.

According to the second Gospel, Jesus charged the Pharisees, the exclusive and the most enlightened representatives of the hierarchy, with two fundamental vices: first, hypocrisy, in that they made religion a trade, and wrapt themselves up in the deceptive show

[1] Mark xii. 38. [2] Matt. xxiii. 1–39. [3] Luke xi. 37–52.

of an extraordinary piety, and, second, self-seeking, which was shown in an excessive fondness for distinction, in long, flowing robes, in the claim they made to be treated with demonstrations of personal reverence and to be awarded seats of honor, and in an unfaithful administration of the trusts committed to their charge. The first Evangelist tells us that Jesus commended their teaching; all that they taught was to be observed, but all the less was their practice to be taken for a guide. It was known that they did not follow their own precepts.[1]

But Jesus surely could not have expressed himself in this way. He would thus have given his countenance, although only indirectly, to the Pharisaic system of forms and formulas.[2] That the Pharisees did not follow their own teachings, he doubtless said. Hence it was inferred by the Evangelist that Jesus esteemed those teachings commendable.

The special charge which Jesus made against the Pharisees was, as is evident also from the third Evangelist,[3] their hypocritical spirit, a disposition of mind closely connected with the literal and formal observances to which they were sworn. For themselves, they seemed to have taken it pretty easily with their formalities. Many of the austere practices which they imposed on others as indispensable duties, they did not themselves touch with so much as a finger. While Jesus pronounced these Pharisaic means of virtue burdensome and scarcely to be borne, he condemned likewise the morality of the Pharisees as an oppressive yoke to the conscience.[4] In the interest of their party, they imposed upon the people who were under their

[1] Matt. xxiii. 3.
[2] See Appendix, Ill. 26, p. 197.
[3] Luke xi. 39.
[4] Matt. xxiii. 4.

influence the fetters of the strictest discipline, thus disabling the nerve of all genuine virtue, freedom, and love. For themselves, their study was to appear pious. They would fain be seen in their devout exercises. And so they made the phylacteries worn on the forehead and arm very broad, and the tassels very long which were attached to the hem of the upper garment as symbols of the honor in which the observances of religion were held. Thus the Pharisees showed their zeal for the law of the Lord. On all these accounts Jesus, therefore, must have condemned not only their practice, but their principles; all the less probable is it that he could really have commended their doctrines.

That their zeal for religion was all a pretence was proved by the absence of all conscientiousness, and the want of reverence for the fundamental principles of the moral law, as shown by their acts. Long prayers, and the plundering of lonely widows committed to their guardianship! Flaming zeal to secure only so much as one proselyte, cost what it might of money, and — afterwards utter moral neglect of their convert! Rigorously stickling for every syllable in form, and boundless levity as to the spirit! High-sounding words in regard to the sanctity of an oath, and such cunning reservations in swearing as the adroitest school of Jesuitism could not excel![1] Fidelity in trifling and indifferent things, and gross neglect in observing the most important moral principles, the most sacred dictates of Right, and especially the indispensable obligations of Justice and Mercy! How well does Jesus liken the Pharisees to those fastidious persons who

[1] Matt. xxiii. 16. They made a distinction between oaths by the temple and by the gold of the temple, by the altar and by the gift on the altar, between oaths by heaven and by the throne of God.

strain their wine before they drink it, lest there should be a fly in it, and yet afterwards swallow down whole camels! With what incomparable truth of nature is that hypocritical zeal here portrayed, that busies itself with the mask of godliness, but not in the slightest degree with its power! Whoever is so conscientious in little things, how careful must he be in great: so judges the ordinary popular understanding. And upon this superficial judgment the whole artificial system of Pharisaic morality relied. It was a system of petty orthodoxy, — of idolatrous devotion to the letter, and utter contempt for the spirit, of all that is moral and sacred.

5. The irreconcilable difference between this system and the character of Jesus and his great work had now to be exhibited in its full extent. It must be proclaimed to the people assembled at the Feast. The momentous question was now to be sent home to every individual, which he would choose, for which he would decide. But how infinitely great and pure does Jesus appear with his truth, his justice and love and humility, the principles of his divine kingdom, with his profound moral earnestness, his cheerful spirit of self-sacrifice, in contrast with those miserable sophistries and tortures! Everything like this punctilious chaffering about trifles was immeasurably removed from the sphere of Jesus. There was no trace here of cunning calculation, of canting impatience for easy and imposing results. Here religious feeling was in intimate alliance with moral effort. There among the Pharisees, on the other hand, — external piety without moral earnestness, a zeal for obligations of which no sense existed in the conscience, — the whole system a structure fabricated by art for the purpose of lording it

over consciences and ruling souls. The conservation of religious usages and traditions, the confirmation and extension of the influence of the spiritual authorities over the laity were the ends kept first in view. As to the revival of a vigorous moral and religious spirit and a reformation proceeding from the central life, the conscience, there was of course no thought, because in such a work the co-operation of free conviction was indispensable. Pharisaism was a system of outward purity and inward corruption. Hence, in describing it, Jesus used with striking effect the image of cups and platters, clean on the outside, but filthy within, where the food is put.[1] Notwithstanding external abstinence and moderation, boundless thirst of getting and gaining within. In spite of the utmost legal precision, within a passion for distinction and power overflowing all restraints. The Pharisees would be everywhere the first, — in the chair of instruction, in the synagogue, at the social feast.[2] In the street they expected to be saluted first. By their pupils they were always to be entitled "Master" (Rabbi). Utter hollowness within was concealed under the cloak of exterior assumption. With knowledge altogether superficial were conjoined arrogant and vague notions of the value of their wisdom.

With such a system Jesus could hold no terms. It must be broken with wholly and forever. There could only be pronounced upon it a woe, the cry of doom to the hierarchy, to the Jewish theologians and priests, and to the party by which these were favored and defended.

The theology and hierarchy of the Jews were morally undermined. And on this account, because

[1] Matt. xxiii. 25. [2] Matt. xxiii. 6.

they had lost the power and the means of a moral reform, Jesus saw that their ruin was inevitable. In comparing their leaders to whitened sepulchres, filled with the bones of the dead, he virtually declared that the worm of death was gnawing at the foundation of the Jewish Church, that its last hour had struck, that it was a moral plague. So is it with every church that magnifies formalities, and is without moral power, without spiritual life. In the judgment of Jesus, the Pharisees were a brood of serpents. They were children of hell, murderers, — murderers of prophets and of souls. They had filled the measure of their reprobate fathers. Their doom was sealed. The Theocracy was ripe for destruction, — the future belonged to the Gospel.[1] The sound of the Woe pronounced by Jesus has not yet died away. It is still ringing to-day, like a trump of judgment, over every church that is founded upon the formulas of tradition and the power of a privileged clergy.

NOTE.

[*a.* p. 189. The scribe whose conversation with Jesus is told in Mark xii. 28 – 34, shows so much candor, and receives from Jesus such warm commendation, that I cannot for a moment suppose, with Dr. Schenkel, that he was an emissary of the opposing party. It is far more likely that his design, in asking the mooted question, Which is the greatest commandment? was to obtain the authority of one so wise as he saw Jesus to be for his own opinion.

Nor does it appear, as our author seems to think, that in answering the question Jesus intended to refute the charge that had been brought against him, of assuming to be equal with God. — TRANS.]

[1] Matt. xxiii. 27.

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE FUTURE OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

1. From the certain conviction at which Jesus had arrived, that the Jewish theocracy was dead, it necessarily followed that Israel itself was ripe for a final judgment. With the impending death of Jesus, now determined upon by the hierarchical party, the fate of Israel was sealed: his death, breathing death to Judaism now expiring amidst its formalities, breathing life to the world struggling for moral and spiritual deliverance. That the theocracy would not give up its schemes for the recovery of national independence, and the establishment of a kingdom of the Messiah as they understood it, was self-evident. The coming conflict between the visions of the future, cherished by the population of Jerusalem on the one hand, and the power of Rome on the other, could end only in the ruin of the weaker party. Strange ordination of events! At the very moment that the hierarchical party was resolved upon the destruction of Jesus, their own destruction was already made certain in the kingdom of God as a necessary event in the historic order of the world.

Jesus had pronounced his crushing discourse against the "Scribes and Pharisees" before the assembled people, among whom there were many doubtless who had come on a pilgrimage to the Feast. As to the consequences to himself, he was not for a moment deceived. Such a speech was not to be endured by the governing party, unless they were willing to resign the last remnant of their authority over the people.

The fore-feeling of his approaching condemnation by the law, and of a cruel and ignominious death, threw an increasing shadow over the soul of Jesus. But in his inmost being there shone a clear beam of hope. His was the ultimate triumph. His enemies were advancing to their ruin. Full of this thought, he conversed with the Twelve, and announced the approaching overthrow of the theocratic constitution, the downfall of Jerusalem, and the desecration of the holy places.[1] It was one of the most powerful and impressive of his utterances.

As he was leaving the outer courts of the temple, — his eye chancing to rest for a while upon its yet unfinished decorations, and some of his disciples breaking forth into exclamations of admiration, — he was suddenly filled with an inexpressible sadness. "Of all this there will not be left one stone upon another!"[2] he cried, the sorrow of the prophet mingling with the consciousness of the future victor. The destruction of the city and the temple, the doom of the immoral, hypocritical, obdurate Church, is at the door. This announcement was proof most impressive to his disciples that his Messianic office had nothing in common with the hopes of the theocracy. Upon their inquiring when these things would occur, he did not withhold his revelations. But here the Evangelists show no slight differences one from another. If, as the first Evangelist states, the disciples further asked for the signs of the glorious reappearance of Christ, and of the completion of the then period of the world,[3] it is certain that the second and third Evangelists know nothing of any such question asked by the disciples, and it is not

[1] Mark xiii. 1; Matt. xxiv. 1; Luke xxi. 5.
[2] Mark xiii. 2; Matt. xxiv. 2; Luke xxi. 6.
[3] Matt. xxiv. 3.

likely that they asked it, as they had not then any idea that the death of Jesus was so near at hand. The aim of Jesus in these predictions was to warn his disciples,[1] from whom he was soon now to be separated forever, of the dangers to which they would be exposed upon the occurrence of the great catastrophe. He had already, at an earlier period, told them of the dangers and trials that awaited them in the work of establishing and extending a Communion founded on principles purely moral and spiritual. The Gospel needed a new soil, new methods and powers. Not until the old temple was destroyed could the new temple arise. So thoroughly were the old religions identified with the established civil order of things, with the whole moral and spiritual condition of the ante-Christian era, that the new religion could look to obtain a peaceful position only through commotions and revolutions that would shake the world to its centre. With clear vision Jesus read the history of the world in the Future. He saw, most plainly, that war must come, — war, invested with all the horrors by which the arbitrament of arms is wont to be attended. That the Jewish hierarchy was advancing towards a bloody and fatal conflict, a conflict in which it must perish, was plain to him beyond all doubt. Just as inevitable was it, in his view, that his Communion would suffer persecution, not only from the Jewish Church before its fall, but far more from the civil authorities of the heathen world. This persecution he regarded as the greater woe, and he had no doubt that his followers would be called to meet it before the doom fell upon the city and the temple. Then would the souls of men be tried. Then would fidelity be put to the test. Then

[1] Mark xiii. 5; Matt. xxiv. 4; Luke xxi. 8.

would the Christian community be winnowed. Then it would behoove the Apostles to persevere to the end.

The greatest woe was, however, the strife that arose in the bosom of his own Communion. Divisions appeared in the very sanctuary of converted households. The father testified before the civil tribunal against his child, and brother against brother. The fierce flame of Gentile (and Jewish) fanaticism knows no sympathy. A man's own blood is at war with itself. The nearest of kin deliver up the friends of the new faith to the executioner. In the days of these tribulations the weak deny their Christian faith. War, persecution, the divisions of families, were, however, only precursors of the End.[1] And what idea had Jesus in the announcement of the "End"?

By the End is most commonly understood "the end of the world." But Jesus had no such meaning. He used the expression simply to indicate the close of the Jewish and Gentile period, the termination of the so-called old world, which was to be succeeded by his Divine kingdom, or, as we express it, by the Christian era, the new world. The destruction of Jerusalem and of the temple, the downfall of the theocratic worship, formed the real dividing line between an old and worn-out condition of things, and a new and expanding development of the life of the nations. With the overthrow of the city and of the temple, and most especially with the awful desecration and devastation of the holy places by the profane hand of the pagan soldier,[2] the theocratic era was, in the eyes of Jesus, peremptorily closed. There was then to be an end to

[1] Mark xiii. 13; Matt. xxiv. 13.

[2] Mark xiii. 14; Matt. xxiv. 15; Luke xxi. 20.

priesthoods, sacrificial offerings, and the sway of spiritual classes.

Jesus loved his country too ardently not to feel its fate most deeply, notwithstanding the obduracy which it had exhibited towards him. Sad was he when he thought of the fugitive, the woman with child, the suckling, the houseless in the winter time. With the horrors of the coming desolation would be the danger to his followers of being seduced from the truth. For, as Jesus knew, the deluded people would cling to the very last to the dream of the conquest of Rome and of universal empire; and demagogues, fanatics, false representatives of the Messianic idea, would drag the weak down into the abyss of ruin with themselves. That Jesus predicted at that time the destruction of Jerusalem and the desolation of the temple, and pronounced these events to be the end of the theocracy, there can be no doubt. He did so in the prophetic consciousness of triumph, anticipating events and claiming the future for his own; and he uttered the prophecy in the presence of those who, in transient possession of power, were vainly trying to revive the dying Past. In this consciousness he was unappalled by the death that awaited him. He was strengthened and elevated by the conviction that from his blood would stream life for the world.

2. But he is reported to have further told of extraordinary appearances in the firmament, the darkening of the sun and the moon, miraculous manifestations in the heavens, and of his own return in person upon a throne of clouds, in pomp and majesty, with a retinue of angels to gather his chosen ones upon the earth.[1] As the disciples asked no questions on this point, may

[1] Mark xiii. 24; Matt. xxiv. 29; Luke xxi. 25.

it not be doubted whether he made such statements of his own motion? That he gave some hints and intimations concerning the fortunes of his cause after the overthrow of the theocracy, we may well suppose. For, by the destruction of the city of the Temple the triumph of the spiritual temple, of the Christian Communion, was undoubtedly sealed.

The saying of Jesus, preserved by both the first two Evangelists,[1] that the Gospel would be preached to all nations as a token of the doom of Jerusalem, they did not rightly understand. It was the downfall of the theocracy that gave a most powerful impulse to the diffusion of the Gospel in the heathen world. The Communion of Christ was then first completely separated from Judaism. The Gentiles then had free access to it. The Christian Church of the world then had its beginning.

It was quite characteristic that Jesus should describe this period as the period of his Future, of his second coming, in a manner, upon earth. He came not again in flesh and blood. But he came in the word and the spirit, as is strikingly intimated in a subsequent Apostolic epistle.[2]

That, in describing this second coming of his Messianic kingdom, Jesus made use of the figurative language familiar to the theocratic modes of thought, is very natural, and as little is it to be wondered at that this language was misunderstood by the disciples, and that, disposed as the Apostolic Christians were to transfer their old Jewish ideas to the person of Christ, it was explained as pointing to a personal reappearance of their Master.

This faith in the second personal appearance of the

[1] Mark xiii. 10; Matt. xxiv. 24. [2] Eph. ii. 17.

Redeemer was thus brought into immediate connection with the destruction of Jerusalem and the desolation of the Temple.

As these last-mentioned events were not followed by the expected appearance of Christ, it became necessary among the more thoughtful members of the Christian Communion to interpret the Future of Jesus in a more spiritual sense. The fourth Gospel affords special evidence in point. In this Gospel the discourse of Jesus, in which the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of that era are announced, is entirely wanting. It cannot, however, escape observation that the essential idea of that discourse is to be found in what Jesus is reported by the fourth Gospel to have said to his disciples when he took farewell of them just before his arrest.[1] When he there tells his disciples that he is going to the Father to prepare a place for them, and that he will come again to take them to himself and unite them to himself most intimately, he thus promises nothing else than a second return to earth. But that the Evangelist did not understand by this second coming a personal, bodily reappearance of Jesus is apparent from the fact that the disciples were to be comforted by a substitute (paraclete, i. e. helper, counsellor, in the place of the departed Jesus), who was to be with them forever, and not, like Jesus, to be taken away from them.[2] They were not to be left orphans. Jesus would come again in his spirit,[3] the spirit of truth. Through this spirit the disciples would be in him and he in his disciples.

Thus, according to the fourth Gospel, the expectation of the second coming of Jesus is transfigured into the expectation of the future revelation of his spirit in his

[1] John xiii. – xvii. [2] John xiv. 3, 16. [3] John xiv. 18.

disciples, while to the world outside of the sphere of the spirit, the coming of the Lord would be unknown. The Holy Spirit, as the future representative of Jesus, was to be the Teacher of mankind in a much higher degree and much more powerfully than Jesus himself was. It could discharge this office, however, only upon the understanding that Jesus was not coming again in his own person. And therefore the Holy Spirit was to bear witness to Jesus, which was requisite only because he could no longer bear witness to himself in his own person.[1] But Jesus considered his ascension to the Father, and the substitution of the Holy Spirit in his place, as an indispensable condition of the continued progress and more comprehensive development of his kingdom. According to the first Evangelist, Jesus declared, in his last discourse to his disciples, that at the close of that period of the world he would sit in judgment upon all mankind.[2] According to the fourth, he told his disciples that the Holy Spirit will judge the world, nay, more, that the prince of this world, (of the then age?) the author of all evil, was judged already by the second period's having begun, — the period of the Holy Spirit.[3] Up to this moment, the moral and religious perceptions of the disciples had been very imperfect. Jesus now promised them that the Holy Spirit would lead them, in the way which he had opened, to all truth. And thus the whole body of his followers would be made ever more perfect in the knowledge of the Highest which they needed, under the lead of the spirit that would be given them, without their requiring a second personal appearance of Jesus.

3. The question, whether the first three Gospels, or the fourth Gospel, have given us the most faithfully

[1] John xv. 26. [2] Matt. xxiv. 30; xxv. 31. [3] John xvi. 7.

the meaning of Jesus in his discourse to his disciples, cannot be allowed to go unanswered. That they all substantially agree is indisputable. It is certain that the original subject of the discourse has almost wholly disappeared in the fourth Gospel. No mention is made, therefore, of a calamity impending over Jerusalem. This Gospel is connected with the wholly changed condition of things, in which it had its origin. The overcoming of the world by the Gospel, which in the first Evangelist is dependent upon the ruin of the fountain-head of the theocracy, had been, according to the fourth Gospel, already for some time accomplished,[1] and, moreover, is not dependent upon external conditions. Jesus in this Gospel foretells a period of severe persecution for his disciples, and he cannot suppress the apprehension that they will be shaken in their faith and fall away from the Gospel.[2] By the blind and obdurate world that knows him not, and thinks it does God a service when it kills his disciples,[3] he intends particularly to refer to the ruling theocratic party. According to this Gospel, also, there was near at hand a mortal contest between that party and his followers. But it is not through the destruction of Jerusalem by the sword of the Roman, but through the triumph of the spirit of truth,[4] that he here looks to be glorified,[5] and he is confident that his high character, for a brief period misunderstood, will be acknowledged in the future. The death hour, with its horror and its shame, will soon be vanquished, and times of joyous exultation will succeed. Love and Fidelity are the moral forces to whose protection Jesus commends his disciples: Love among the brethren in the spirit of self-sacrifice,

[1] John xvi. 33. [2] John xvi. 1. [3] John xv. 18; xvi. 2.
[4] John xvi. 14. [5] John xvi. 16.

of which he himself had given an example,[1] and Fidelity towards their Master, which he described so impressively under the similitude of the vine and its branches, thereby representing himself as the spring of life, whence in spiritual communion with him the disciples drew unconquerable strength for ever new efforts and triumphs.[2]

Thus the fourth Gospel faithfully reflects the true meaning of Jesus in what he said to his disciples in the Temple, so far as the future of his kingdom is concerned, but without any allusion to the connection in which these things were said, or to the occasion that called them forth. In the most essential point it gives us the real thought of Jesus more correctly than the first three Gospels. In that interesting moment, under the pinnacles of the Temple whose beauty drew from his disciples expressions of admiring wonder, Jesus announced the speedy destruction of all that magnificence and the elevation of the spiritual Temple of his Communion through the power of his word and his spirit. This last event he represented as a second coming of himself. He spoke, in the strong figurative language of the Orient, of the grand influence of this exaltation of Christianity over Judaism and Heathenism. And naturally enough he associated this event with great physical phenomena. The Apostolic Communion has not yet reached the height of this idea of the Master. Christian tradition was not able to rise to this faith in the power of the Word and the Spirit. Thus the clear, divine thoughts of Jesus in regard to the Future have been corrupted into gross earthly expectations. Thus Chiliasm,[3] rooted in the represen-

[1] John xv. 12. [2] John xv. 1.

[3] [Doctrine of the Millennium. TRANS.]

tations of the first three Gospels, is a sickly offshoot of the Jewish idea of the Messiah still lingering in Christianity, a remnant of the religion of the letter and of sensuous illusion still remaining in the religion of the Spirit and of Truth.[1]

NOTE.

[The subject of this chapter is a very difficult one, and the difficulty arises from the fact that the predictions of Jesus have come down to us through a highly colored Jewish medium. These predictions relate to points upon which his countrymen had very peculiar and extravagant ideas, — ideas by which the reporters of these predictions, sharing in the popular modes of thinking, could not fail to be influenced. While there is much that is valuable and interesting in our author's exposition of this portion of the New Testament history, we feel the need of more satisfactory light.

The first Evangelist states (ch. xxiv. 3) that the disciples asked, "When shall these things be? And what shall be *the sign* of thy coming and of the end of the world?" Dr. Schenkel thinks they could not possibly have asked such a question, as "they had not then any idea that the death of Jesus was so near at hand." (p. 400.) But it must be borne in mind, that, while his disciples believed him to be the Messiah, they evidently did not consider him as having yet *come*. He was the Messiah to them, but as yet the Messiah, in a manner, in disguise, the Messiah *incognito*. When they asked, therefore, about his *coming*, it was not of his "reappearance" after death that they were thinking. It was not what we call a "second coming" that they had in their minds, for they did not regard him as having yet, properly speaking, *come* at all. The great Coming was yet to be, and to the day of their death they looked for it momently. When, therefore, Jesus said that the Temple, which they were admiring, would be razed to the ground, it was natural that they should suppose that it was to be destroyed when he should openly

[1] See Appendix, Ill. 27, p. 212.

assume his high office as the Messiah, i. e. when he should *come*. And the question ascribed to them in the first Gospel, so far from being impossible, appears to me to be of an "historical" character. It is observable, by the way, that they ask for "*the sign*" of his coming, showing, does it not? that the Pharisees, in making the same demand upon him, had only given expression to what was a popular expectation, namely, that when the Messiah should appear he would give some signal, or sign, whereby the nation would recognize him beyond the possibility of mistake.

It is not yet possible to indicate with any precision the extent to which the Messianic ideas of his Jewish reporters have colored the utterances of Jesus in regard to the events which his profound prophetic insight saw coming in the future that lay before him. Before his penetrating vision, much, it is evident, lay plain and clear, that was entirely hidden from his country and his age. He saw at hand the conflict that was inevitable between the Jews and the power of Rome. And he saw with equal clearness that the ruin of the former was alike certain. And, furthermore, so comprehensive and so far-reaching were his views of the Eternal Providence,— which, as he taught, overlooked not a sparrow's fall, — that what was hidden from all other eyes, was visible to him, and he foresaw that the destruction of the city and the Temple, whose existence was identified in the faith of his countrymen with the existence of the world, was an event necessary, in the Divine order and will, to the introduction of a better condition of things. In the conscious power of the truth which was supreme in his own bosom, and which was the central life of the religion of his country, buried as it was under a cumbrous, dead formalism, and imprisoned and fettered by Pharisaic exclusiveness and bigotry, he felt that that truth was to expand and fill the world. He confessed that God alone knew the time and the hour. That he anticipated a speedier triumph of the truth than has been realized is very probable. But the wonder is, not that he did not foresee more, but that he foresaw so much, not that his sight did not extend further, but that it extended so far. Wonderful, after all, as his prophetic insight was, it is no more than was to be looked for in one who on all occasions and in so many ways showed himself so extraordinarily wise and true. How could the future hide itself from that eye to which the present was naked and bare? He who knew, as it would seem, by instinct and intuition how to make circumstances the most ad-

verse so entirely subservient to his uses, that they seem now to have been ordered for the express purpose of moulding his personal being to a divine perfection, — how could he fail to read the future in the present, and discern in man's nature, man's destiny? How grandly in the twenty-fifth chapter of the first Gospel (31 – 46) is the time foretold when humanity shall be the standard by which all nations shall be judged! The costume of that great prophecy belongs to the country and the age, but the central truth was his own.

It is difficult to agree with Dr. Schenkel, that the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth chapters of the first Gospel, and the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth of the fourth, relate to the same occasion, and are different reports of the same discourse and the same conversation of Jesus with his disciples. The difference between the two Gospels in these passages is altogether too great to warrant such a supposition. They differ not only in detail, but in their whole tenor. It is highly probable that the passage in the fourth Gospel, extending from the fourteenth chapter to the seventeenth inclusive, is a very free amplification of the utterances of Jesus on the occasion. If not written by John himself, it is the production of an eminently spiritually-minded person in profound sympathy with Jesus, working upon notes and communications received from John, catching their very spirit and the tone of the occasion, and fusing the whole in the glow of his own feelings, doing this so unconsciously that he imagined that all that he wrote was received from John. As I have elsewhere remarked, it is by no means necessary to suppose that the name of John was attached to the fourth Gospel in order to clothe it with an authority of which it would otherwise be destitute. Is it not supposable that the fourth Gospel was composed by one who was in intimate communication with John, or who, in some way or another, obtained possession of materials furnished by the Apostle, which materials may indeed have been in most respects brief and scanty; but they grew so, in the quick and ardent mind of the writer, that he gave them the form in which this Gospel has come down to us, using them in all honesty, and giving John the entire credit, because he felt that they belonged to the Apostle far more than to himself? At all events, there is a touching and subduing charm in that part of the fourth Gospel above referred to which criticism may not be able

to define, but cannot extinguish. It breathes through those memorable chapters from that profoundly sad occasion when Jesus had taken his last meal with those humble friends of his, and they had at last been made to feel that he was about to be taken away from them, and they were to be left alone, with all their bright hopes shivered in the dust. It was from a heart bowed down under the immediate prospect of a lonely and terrible death, and yet not absorbed in its own awful fate, but bleeding out its inexhaustible sympathy, that those immortal consolations streamed. Those chapters of the fourth Gospel are imbued with a personal feeling of which no trace appears in the predictions in the other Gospels which our author refers to the same occasion. After such an effort to comfort his disciples at a moment when it was he himself who most needed comfort, we cannot wonder at the scene of agony shortly afterwards in the garden, when in that lonely place and in the still midnight Jesus suffered a natural revulsion of feeling, and his own sorrows, kept off so long by such extraordinary strength of mind, suddenly came rushing upon him and threatened for a while to overwhelm him.

That Jesus should have predicted in a general way, as is stated in the first three Gospels, extraordinary appearances in the heavens in connection with the great events that he foretold, appears to me entirely natural. Such appearances — meteors, shooting stars, eclipses, peculiar appearances of the sun and the moon — are always occurring, and necessarily so often coincidently with great revolutions in the history of human affairs, that they have always been regarded, especially in ancient times, as portents and precursors of such revolutions. The prophecy of Jesus, therefore, was to the effect that there would be nothing wanting to indicate the greatness of the events that were at hand, that the violent commotions and terrible calamities which were coming would be accompanied by the extraordinary signs and portents that attend all great occurrences.

That Jesus ever promised to appear himself arrayed in visible glory cannot be supposed consistently with the pre-eminent spirituality of his teachings and his character. It is much more likely that he was misunderstood by his disciples, whose minds were teeming with visions of Messianic magnificence, than that he should make any such promise. — Trans.]

SEVENTH SECTION.

THE CONSUMMATION.

CHAPTER XXIV.

THE CONSECRATION BY ANOINTING.

1. While the events just related were taking place, the time of the Passover was drawing nigh. The crowds of pilgrims increased in the holy city. The strict hierarchical party in the High Council had for some time been resolved upon the prosecution of Jesus, but doubts appear to have arisen whether it should be undertaken immediately, during the season of the Festival, or be deferred till the Festival was over. Danger was apprehended from his numerous friends among the Galileans who had come to the Passover, and who the hierarchy feared might rise in his favor. But opportunity was given for immediate proceedings by the unexpected overtures of one of the Twelve, Judas of Kerioth, who informed the leaders of the hierarchy that he was ready to deliver his Master into their hands in a manner that would cause the least possible disturbance. How came an Apostle to become a traitor? A dark page in the history of the Redeemer here lies open before us. Will light ever be shed upon it?

If, as is commonly assumed, Jesus were all-knowing, or even had he been endowed with superhuman

knowledge, he must have known when he called Judas to be a disciple, that he was taking a serpent to his bosom, training up a future traitor, a child of darkness, in which case the grave question presents itself, with all the weight of its unavoidable inferences, How came Jesus, notwithstanding his foreknowledge of the certain treachery of Judas, to receive him into immediate connection with his own person, and into the service of his sacred Cause? If he were convinced that Judas could never be a worthy instrument in his service, why did he call him? When he knew that he had taken a traitor to his bosom, why did he not send him away? If he were indubitably certain that the connection of Judas with him and his Cause must be the occasion of the temporal and eternal ruin of Judas, why did he not break at once the fatal tie? So much was imperatively demanded of Jesus, as due to the cause of the Gospel, to himself, and to Judas. Upon the supposition that Jesus had exact knowledge from the beginning of the fate of Judas, it was the duty of wisdom, of self-respect, and of humanity, either not to have allowed the connection with Judas, or to have dissolved it as soon as possible. We are delivered from this great difficulty by the supposition that Jesus, when he received Judas among his immediate disciples did not foresee his treachery, and that when he began to doubt his moral purity, he was not without hope of keeping the unhappy man from the path of destruction.

The position of Judas is of great significance in estimating the character of Jesus. On this account it requires a more thorough consideration. Judas was not among the first that were called to the company of disciples. He became a disciple when the number was

increased to twelve.[1] He was not distinguished by Jesus in any way. In the short missionary excursions upon which Jesus sent his disciples, Judas was doubtless employed with the rest. The circumstance that he had charge of "the bag" is mentioned only in the fourth Gospel.[2] That Jesus should thus have trusted him is, from the point of view of this Gospel, the more unlikely, as, according to this Gospel, Jesus looked upon Judas as a "devil," and knew from the first that he would betray him.

2. That Jesus knew from the beginning that Judas was a thoroughly bad man, and yet received him among the Twelve, is altogether impossible. There is reason to suppose, rather, that it was not until the last abode of Jesus in Judea, and in consequence of the last discourse of Jesus to his disciples in the Temple, that the thought of playing false took definite shape in the mind of Judas. At an earlier period he had been, with the rest of the disciples, in a state of uncertainty as to the peculiar aims of Jesus. He had shared in the error of believing that Jesus would establish the Messiah's kingdom promised by the Old Testament prophets, and would not withhold from his disciples a due participation in the power and glory thereof. The solemn entry of Jesus into Jerusalem, amidst the acclamations of the people, may have tended to confirm him in the error. But the scene in the Temple, the declaration of Jesus that the theocratic worship would come to an end, the trouble arising with the ecclesiastical authorities, the disclosures made by Jesus with increasing emphasis respecting the speedy death that awaited him by violence and with shame, and the dark fate awaiting his disciples, and perhaps also some secret intelligence

[1] Mark iii. 9; Matt. x. 4; Luke vi. 19. [2] John xii. 6; xiii. 29.

received in regard to the hostile measures against Jesus resolved upon by the High Council, — all these things were heavy blows to the heart of Judas, thirsting for honor and power. Instead of dominion, service, instead of power, persecution, instead of honor, shame, — this was all that was left to him after hopes and prospects once so brilliant. A sudden and complete awaking from a great delusion best explains the sudden revolution of feeling in one who held himself to have been grossly deceived.

It escaped him, in his gross blindness, that he had deceived himself. He rushed at once into a state of furious exasperation. In an instant his cherished idea had vanished. A stern fate, like that which had been so plainly foretold to him, he was not the man to bear. The love he had borne for Jesus turned into hatred, for to Jesus he imputed as its author the bitter chagrin that he felt upon awaking from his delusion. This exasperation, this hatred, appears to have broken forth in Bethany, two days before the Passover. What occurred there has come down to us, in somewhat different forms indeed, through the different channels of tradition. The accounts, however, pretty well agree in substance.[1] In all, there is a woman who anoints Jesus, there are disciples (or at least there is a disciple, a Pharisee according to the third Gospel) who are displeased with the woman and reprove her for it, and there is Jesus who commends her. In the third Gospel the essential fact has suffered very considerable change. The spirit of the story is in full keeping with the immediate proximity of the final catastrophe. The outpouring of the ointment is a most expressive symbol

[1] Mark xiv. 3; Matt. xxvi. 6; Luke vii. 36; John xii. 1. See also Appendix, Ill. 28, p. 219.

of the devoted foreboding love of the disciples already fearing the worst. It is in keeping also that Jesus should interpret the act as an office consecrating him to his approaching death.

This touching token of the love of one, who was distinguished for her fidelity even to death, appears to have kindled into a flame the hate smouldering in the breast of Judas. He, a disciple, frantic at the ruin of those hopes which, in his overpowering but coarse enthusiasm, he had identified with the person of Jesus, — she, another disciple, inspired, elevated by the conviction that Jesus, as the true Messiah, had now relinquished forever all earthly hopes and was resolved to seal the work of his life with his blood, — what a contrast! That office performed at the table, made sacred to the woman by her love, was his consecration to death. The disciples, with Judas doubtless at their head, murmured at this act of love, concealing their indignation under the pretext that the money for which the precious ointment might have been sold would have been better given to the poor. Jesus was known, in fact, as the friend and helper of the needy and the suffering. How much want might have been relieved by so large a sum! How many tears might have been wiped away! The murmurings of the disciples arose under the erroneous impression that it was the special office of Jesus to alleviate physical suffering. The woman, with greater truth, recognized in him the deliverer from spiritual poverty; and, viewing him thus, she saw clearly the necessity of his offering up his life for his holy cause. She felt that such a death should have its symbolical consecration, and all the more needful was it because they who were dedicated to his work did not yet appear to have any right idea of the

necessity of the self-sacrifice laid upon Jesus. They would rather have had him anointed for the throne upon Mount Zion than for the Cross upon Golgotha.

3. But how significant is the reply that comes from the lips of Jesus to the fault-finding of the disciples! There is nothing bitter here, or severe. From first to last it is characteristic of Jesus that prejudices, and even passions excited by false impressions and expectations, were dealt with by him with the greatest tenderness. The sympathy for the poor, expressed in the objection of the disciples, was in itself commendable, but it was a sympathy that might be manifested at any time. The sympathy awakened in us when we see others destitute of what we are enjoying, or of what we possess to superfluity, springs from a benevolence akin to selfishness, and is found in unconverted men. In the words, "The poor ye have always with you, and when ye will ye can do them good," Jesus plainly recognizes the duty of the Christian Communion to care for the poor. But this is a universal duty. At that moment there was a quite special and much higher duty to be fulfilled. The stubborn heart, ever flattering itself with false Messianic hopes, was to be brought down. The disciples had, first of all, to open their minds to the supreme conviction that faith in the future of God's kingdom was to be shown in self-sacrificing love. It was of the first necessity that the idea of a suffering and dying Messiah, of such a Messiah as the establishment of a New Covenant required, should be acknowledged and appreciated in its necessity and power. The deep significance of the anointing in Bethany lay in this, that it gave expression, simple, intelligible, and touching, to this acknowledgment and this appreciation. The simple eye of a woman saw farther

than the keen vision of men, and she with her deep sensibility understood the future more truly than they with all their calculations. What Jesus said in commendation of her act has been handed down to us most correctly by the second Gospel: "She hath done what she could. She is come aforehand to anoint my body to the burying. Verily, I say unto you, wheresoever this Gospel shall be preached throughout the whole world, this also that she hath done will be spoken of for a memorial of her."[1] Thus Jesus regarded this office of love, his anointing, as intimately connected with the future publication of his Gospel in the heathen world. Thus was his death emphatically proclaimed to be, not only a fountain of power, of elevation, of sanctification for all the members of his Communion, but also the indispensable condition upon which depended the abolition of the theocratic Constitution, and the recognition of the religious equality of Jews and Gentiles. The woman who anointed him was the first to discern in its full worth the significance of his death in relation to the future, and to give expression to her faith by that symbolical act.

Thus she presents a contrast, the sharpest and most striking, to Judas, the disciple who, in his uncontrollable rage, suffered himself to be hurried away into treachery towards his Lord and Master. She offers up her money, in order worthily to celebrate the approaching death of Jesus, in a prophetic sense of the blessings to flow therefrom. He takes money from the hands of the deadly enemies of Jesus, in order to gain what he could from the now accursed connection with him, and by helping to accelerate his death. In the former we see childlike self-forgetfulness, the pure

[1] Mark xiv. 8.

spirit that asks nothing for itself, but would give all in love of the departing Master, going to his death. In the latter, base self-love, the darkened heart, which awaking from a great delusion, in bitter hate, deems no means too base to satisfy its revenge. In secret interviews with persons sent to him by the hierarchical party, Judas had probably become satisfied that the destruction of Jesus was inevitable. What, then, could he do better than turn the case to his own advantage? The love of gain was throughout only a secondary motive of his treachery. The prime object was revenge. It was not with cool, calculating selfishness that he went to work in the first instance. How could Jesus have ever admitted a cunning self-seeker among his disciples? Judas was a man of a hot-blooded temperament, of an excitable, jealous spirit, rash in his resolutions, hasty in his acts. This is shown by his death, probably by his own hand.[1] His remorse after the condemnation of Jesus was sincere.[2] It could hardly have been, as is supposed by many, that it was the shock, which the unexpected result of the trial of Jesus gave him, that led him to lay violent hands on himself, but rather the agonizing self-reproach that he felt at the treachery of which, in his blind rage, he had been guilty. His case illustrates the moral law, which experience attests, that the sins of passion first come home to the deluded conscience through their consequences, too late for reparation before men, but not too late to be expiated before God.

Thus viewing the case of Judas, we at least see nothing inexplicable in the fact that Jesus received him

[1] Matt. xxvii. 5. Less credible is the later tradition (Acts i. 18), according to which he did not hang himself, but lost his life by a fall.

[2] Matt. xxvii. 4.

into the company of the Apostles. When Jesus called him, he was, on the whole, no better and no worse than his associates. He had fixed his hopes on the "consolation of Israel." He looked for their fulfilment through the restoration of a reformed theocratic order of things. The first moment that Jesus asserted his Messiahship, he believed in a coming theocratic empire of the world under the sceptre of Jesus. He would have labored with the rest with passionate devotion to set up the Messianic throne of Jesus. Jesus trusted that he as well as the others would in due time undergo a moral change. Unhappily no such change came over him. It is only at critical moments that men are put to the proof. Judas proved false in the hour of trial. This fact casts no shade upon the character of Jesus. He had erred in his judgment of Judas, but the error sprang from the purest motives. He hoped for a gradual correction of the will, and for an ultimate conquest of the prejudices and passions of his disciple. That the vision of Judas was blinded in the hour of danger, and that his will succumbed to the powers of darkness, was an event unforeseen, one of the heaviest sorrows that befell Jesus on his thorny way. On the very threshold of the final decision, he beheld the little band of his most intimate friends divided between love and hatred, most of them wavering, fearful, losing all heart, one of them filled with the bitterest rancor. Into this cup of sorrow the woman, who anointed him in Bethany, poured a drop of soothing balm. She understood the character and the work of the Master. In her loving and hopeful soul his kingdom had found a firm place. Like a prophetess, she pointed from the nocturnal shade of death to the morning splendor of a bright Future. That act

in Bethany consecrating his self-sacrificing death by the hand of that gentle disciple, was the Consecration of his work on earth. Anointed with the oil of love he went, comforted and serene in the calmest wisdom and with consummate patience, to meet his awful fate.

NOTE.

[The view taken in this chapter of the anointing of Jesus by Mary, and by which this incident is elevated into a necessary and solemn juncture in his history, is rendered probable only by an assumption which appears to me to lack sufficient authority. It supposes an extraordinary degree of spiritual discernment in Mary, in that, according to Dr. Schenkel, she recognized the necessity and significance of the death of Jesus. If she did, her spiritual insight was hardly second to that of Jesus himself.

As I have already had occasion to remark, our author, I think, misunderstands the nature of the chief influence which Jesus exercised upon his personal disciples during his lifetime. He appears to think that Jesus was steadily initiating them into the spiritual nature of his kingdom. He was doing so; but, as is most important to be observed, not so much through the understanding, not so much by his verbal instructions, as through their hearts, in which he was awakening new affections. His verbal instructions were slowly interpreted by events, and chiefly by his death, through which a spirit of mind was communicated to his disciples, that true spirit, that brought to their remembrance what he had said and enabled them to understand him. That they were growing more and more attached to his person, learning to reverence him and confide in him more and more surely, there can be no question. Neither can there be any doubt that they were steadily becoming more and more fully persuaded that he was the Messiah promised by the prophets. But the more their faith was confirmed in him, the more firmly were they convinced that he would realize their fond hopes of worldly good, and the more incapable did they become of believing that he could suffer a violent and shameful death. How

earnestly did Peter resent the idea of such a fate for his Master, at the very moment that he had avowed his faith in the Messiahship of Jesus! The reason, so far as his immediate disciples were concerned, why it was necessary that he should leave them was that, so long as he was with them, they would persist in the worldly expectations, which their belief in his Messiahship fostered.

As for Mary and the other women who "ministered" to him, their attachment was far less alloyed, doubtless, than that of the men by worldly expectations. It was not in their woman's nature to cherish with equal ardor those ambitious hopes. But still there is no reason to suppose that their Messianic ideas differed materially from the popular opinions of the time. To Mary, Jesus was a very Prince, probably, already. And I can see no ground for supposing that, in breaking that box of precious ointment over his person, she had any thought but to express her deep personal reverence for him. Such an act was in perfect keeping with Oriental customs, which authorized a liberal use of perfumed unguents upon hospitable occasions. If Mary, whose deep tenderness of nature was shown at the grave of her brother, had had any clear foresight of the awful death that was impending over Jesus, would she not have been overwhelmed by the appalling prospect? Would she not have shrunk from an act which, if she meant it as Dr. Schenkel represents, must have seemed to her as if she herself were dooming him to that horrible fate? If she had so intended it, and if it were because she so intended it that Jesus commended her, how is it that he interpreted it, not in the sense of a consecrating office, but as his embalming? She poured the costly ointment upon him, simply, I apprehend, in token of her profound personal veneration for him. It was not as the Messiah that was to be, but as the present king of her soul, that she offered him this expression of her homage. Probably that box of ointment was the costliest thing that she possessed, and she felt moved to honor him by the offering of the best that she had. And what struck Jesus was the coincidence of this act with his death, which he alone had foresight of as very near at hand. Mary had no thought of embalming him. Her whole gentle heart would have shrunk from the idea. All the more striking was the act to Jesus. It is evident, as he approached the dark hour that was before him, that the images of death thronged thick and fast upon him. So only can be explained his emotion, his deep melancholy at the grave of Lazarus. It was the full sense of his

own lonely and fearful fate that moved him then to groans and tears. The tokens of sympathy and death then presented all around him, the weeping sisters, their friends weeping with them, and the sight of the grave, how must these things have brought home to him with overpowering effect the consciousness that he was shortly to suffer, unwept, forsaken, alone! Then again at the last Supper, so vividly did the broken bread and the red wine bring up before him the images of his own mangled body and streaming blood, that for the moment he lost sight of the visible symbols, and exclaimed, "It is my body!" "It is my blood!" And so also it was when Mary poured the ointment upon his head. It instantly had a funereal scent to him. And he interpreted the act as his embalming. How very significant, from its very delicacy, is his allusion to his death in the words, "Ye have the poor always with you, but *me ye have not always*." And so struck was he with the coincidence of the act of Mary and his own near burial, that it came to him like a providential event, — something sacred, that must not be interfered with or criticised, but accepted, — one of those occurrences which never could be forgotten, but must be told and remembered everywhere and forever. At first sight the suggestion that it was a great waste, that the poor might have been relieved instead, is a very plausible one, and one which under other circumstances Jesus himself, we think, would have been the first to make. But there is no trait of his character finer, more exquisite, than his instinctive recognition of occasions. His feeling is always in admirable symmetry with the exigencies of the moment, and marked with a perfect fitness. At the first glance we are ready to ask, Is he who thus freely accepts so costly a token of personal respect, who seems to put his own personal claims before the claims of the poor, — is he the same who on other occasions disclaimed so peremptorily all personal homage, forbidding a young man at one time to call him good, and at another rebuking a woman who broke forth in blessings upon his mother? But the apparent inconsistency vanishes when we look carefully into the particular circumstances of these several occasions, and a deeper consistency is disclosed, and we perceive how finely and yet how all unconsciously his feeling was adjusted to the moment, how seasonable it always was, and pertinent. He was not fettered by formulas, or disabled and driven into senseless and untimely exaggeration by mere abstractions. He recognized in the act of Mary a truth of feeling, a sanctity of affection,

which was not to be frustrated or postponed, even to the claims of the poor, most especially as it was performed at such a moment when his death was so near at hand. And did he not rightly judge? What is the small amount of physical relief which the price of the ointment would have afforded the poor, compared with the fragrance of that act, vitalizing all the air that men breathe forever!

Dr. Schenkel thinks the incident related by Luke (vii. 36 – 50) is the same incident told by Matthew (xxvi. 6 – 13), by Mark (xiv. 3 – 9), and by John (xii. 3 – 8). But the story in Luke is in substance so entirely different from that given in the other three Gospels, that I find it much easier to suppose that some of the particulars of the two stories, coinciding as they do in certain obvious respects, early got confounded with each other in the Evangelical narratives, than that they refer to only one and the same occasion. Both Matthew and Mark state, that the woman poured the ointment *on the head* of Jesus, while in Luke and John it was *the feet* of Jesus that were anointed. Luke states that the woman who anointed Jesus, was a "sinner," a woman of notoriously bad character, and the parable of the two debtors, which Jesus relates, implies that she had sinned greatly. John tells us that it was Mary, the sister of Lazarus and Martha, who anointed him. Although Jesus treated the penitent with great tenderness, yet it is difficult to suppose that Mary, who, we are told by John was with her brother and sister an intimate friend of Jesus, could have been a person of the character ascribed to the woman whom Luke tells us of. Had Mary suffered any loss of character, she would hardly have had friends from Jerusalem visiting and condoling with her upon the death of Lazarus. As both the women anointed Jesus, the one, Mary, breaking the box of ointment over his head, while the other, an unknown woman, anointed his feet, I cannot but think that the manner of the act early got transferred from one story to the other, and that there is an error in John's Gospel where it states that Mary anointed the feet of Jesus and wiped them with her hair. There is a mistake there, I am strongly inclined to suspect.

As to Judas, our knowledge of him is not sufficient to enable us to pronounce with confidence upon any explanation that may be given of his treachery. That he was received by Jesus into the company of the Twelve, is abundant proof that he was by no means a man utterly depraved. And his great and quick re-

morse is certainly not an indication of a character hardened in evil. The common belief that it was the love of money that was his ruin, appears to me on the whole most probable. Being perhaps a man of cooler temperament than the other disciples, he probably saw more clearly than the others the formidable character of the opposition to Jesus, and how idle it was to expect that the glories of the Messiah's kingdom were to be realized through a person of such low origin and of such humble circumstances as his Master. It may be doubted whether his design was fully matured when he and the rest sat down with Jesus to the last Supper. It was what occurred at the table that brought him to the resolution of executing his purpose without any further delay. How Jesus discovered his meditated treachery we are not told. There are so many ways in which Jesus may have come to a knowledge of it, that it is not at all necessary to suppose his foreknowledge of it miraculous. Jesus treated Judas on that memorable evening, knowing him to be a traitor, with that characteristic magnanimity for which we can find no parallel. In the next chapter, Dr. Schenkel represents it as apparently inexplicable that Jesus, knowing that Judas was in league with his enemies did not expel him on that evening from the company. But the explanation which Dr. Schenkel suggests is both obvious and satisfactory. The crime which Judas meditated was not yet consummated. The conscience of the traitor might yet be reached. To have driven him away would have been equivalent to hurrying him on to the execution of his traitorous design. And besides Jesus wished for a few last moments with his disciples, and so long as Judas was present, he must have felt himself in some degree secure from arrest. He felt, however, that it was necessary to let his disciples know that he knew what was going to take place, as he said, "I tell you before it happens, so that when it does happen, your faith in me may not be shaken, and you will recollect that I was prepared for it." (John xiii. 19.) But he does not mention the name of the traitor. He confides it only to John in a whisper, and not even to him directly, but by a sign, lest, as it appears, the others, who were watching him, should catch it from the motion of his lips. Thus he avoided exciting against Judas the wrath of his fellow-disciples. Could the wretched man have only caught the faintest glimpse of that great and generous heart, and thrown himself in confession and remorse at the feet of his Master, who had just washed *his* feet, without, I

doubt not, one shadow of personal unkindness in his mind, but only with infinite pity, would he not have received at once the kiss of forgiveness and peace? But the vision of that divine love was hidden from Judas by his demon passions, which rose at once so fiercely and so filled all his soul, that John saw the devil in him in his countenance. (John xiii. 27.) He could have no thought but that he was about to be exposed before them all, and, stung and maddened, he rose up and left the room, resolved irrevocably now, since he was suspected and charged with being a traitor, that he would be revenged, and be a traitor indeed. — TRANS.]

CHAPTER XXV.

THE SUPPER.

1. ON the evening of the fourteenth of the month Nisan, at the time appointed by the Law for the sacrifice of the Paschal lamb, Jesus desired to celebrate the Passover with his disciples. It is somewhat surprising that he should have had this desire, since he had renounced the obligations of the ceremonial law, and had at last completely broken with the theocratic order of things. On this account, many accept the representation of the fourth Gospel, according to which he did not really observe the Passover, but only sat down with his intimate friends to a parting meal, which had no immediate relation to the Passover, the day before that appointed for the Feast, on the evening of the thirteenth day of Nisan. We regard, however, as entitled to credit the unanimous statement of the first three Gospels, that he really observed the Passover on the fourteenth with his disciples. The account of the fourth Evangelist is encumbered with very serious

difficulties. Its correctness being supposed, it is especially difficult to understand how the tradition in which the other three Evangelists agree, namely, that Jesus partook of the Paschal lamb with his disciples, could have arisen, certified as it is by the original authority of Mark, who derived his account from Peter. Still more inexplicable is it that the fourth Gospel omits, together with the Paschal feast, the institution of the Supper, which, according to the first three Gospels, stands in indissoluble connection with it. It is not at all credible that Jesus celebrated the Paschal feast in the ordinary theocratic meaning of the word. It was not that ceremony that he observed, according to the first three Gospels. As is clear from their account, Jesus simply made use of the legally prescribed observance in order to institute in immediate connection therewith another feast, — the feast of the New Covenant. Accordingly, he celebrated the Passover, not to authorize, but to abolish it. The celebration of the first Lord's Supper was connected by necessary consequence with the celebration of the last Paschal supper, the abolition of the Old Covenant with the inauguration of the New.

The Paschal feast, therefore, which Jesus celebrated with his disciples is only the last of a series of previously arranged acts, a solemn ending in view of his death and of the formal institution of his Communion. Without such a conclusion the work of Jesus would have lacked completeness. It was necessary that, once more before his departure, he should declare, in the circle of his Apostles, with the utmost solemnity and by a symbolical act, stamping itself on the memory forever, that the Old Covenant had now come to an end, and that a New Covenant had taken its place.

Thus the celebration of the Paschal feast stands in significant connection with the consecration at Bethany. The death that awaited Jesus, to which, with a thorough understanding of it, the woman had dedicated him, must be placed in the pure light of the future of the divine kingdom by the Master himself before the disciples, from whom its deeper significance had been hidden. He must set it before their eyes with overpowering force as the imperishable foundation of a new spiritual communion between God and all mankind.

2. But of the last Supper of Jesus with his disciples, thus understood, there is not the slightest trace in the fourth Gospel. There is a supper,[1] but not this supper. The Evangelist is interested solely in relating what followed the supper: the washing of the disciples' feet, and various things said by Jesus in connection therewith. That the washing of the feet of the disciples, related by this Evangelist, is a fact, there can be no doubt. But at the same time it is certain, that if Jesus, at the conclusion of the last meal with his disciples, instituted the Supper, he could not at the same hour have performed the act of washing the feet of the disciples also. Two symbolical acts so essentially different and so unlike in aim could not have taken place at one and the same time; the impression of one would necessarily have obliterated the impression of the other. As, moreover, the washing of the disciples' feet had no relation to the death of Jesus, — that essential condition of the New Covenant, — it is not to be believed that it took place in that parting hour. It must have occurred at an earlier period.

The representation of Jesus in the fourth Gospel shows, in the portion of it devoted to his last hours, the

[1] John xiii. 2.

same coloring, the same ground-tone, which we have remarked in its earlier chapters. Long before the death of Jesus all is defined, completed. The disciples, with the exception of the traitor, are all pure;[1] they require no further cleansing save from a few special failings. Jesus himself is already glorified, and God is glorified in him.[2] According to such representations, an institution like the Supper was by no means essentially needed. To what purpose the distribution of earthly bread, when the person of Jesus Christ is the only true bread coming down from heaven?[3] Why dispense the wine of earth, when his person is the living water springing unto everlasting life?[4] Faith in his person stills all hunger and quenches all thirst. It is not merely his final submission to the death of the Cross, but it is his giving his flesh for the world, which is a heavenly source of nourishment.[5] Therefore were the Jews required to eat the flesh and drink the blood of the living Christ.[6] How remote from the point of view of this Gospel is any thought of partaking of material food in order to receive spiritual nourishment, is shown by the remark that the spirit giveth life, but the flesh profiteth nothing, and that the words of Jesus, as a source of nourishment to the world, are spirit and life.[7] There is no doubt that, at the time when the fourth Gospel was composed, a physical efficacy, a magical influence, was already beginning to be ascribed to the solemnity of the Lord's Supper, — an idea which the Evangelist held himself bound to combat. A presentiment of the inconceivable delusions and fatal abuses by which the observance of this rite

[1] John xiii. 10. [2] John xiii. 31. [3] John vi. 33.
[4] John iv. 14. [5] John vi. 51. [6] John vi. 53.
[7] John vi. 63.

has been overcast, and which has rendered it the most fruitful source of superstition and strife, appears to have arisen in the mind of the Evangelist, and he probably thought that he might do somewhat to check the threatening danger by not mentioning the institution at all, although it must, without doubt, have been known to him as an institution of Christ's. And here also may be the reason why he placed the last supper of Jesus and his disciples a day earlier, and connected with it the washing of the disciples' feet, — an act which was peculiarly fitted to humble that priestly pride which, contrary to the original design of the founder, afterwards found in the Lord's Supper its main support.

3. Jesus really observed the Paschal supper on the evening of the fourteenth day of Nisan, as the Palestinian traditions, having no special point to serve, unanimously attest.[1] He had seen through the designs of Judas, and had not prevented them. He could not really have effected any change in his fate. He well knew that by a strict construction of the statutes of the Old Covenant, his life was forfeited. He could have no doubt that his enemies would not rest until they had destroyed him. That his death had become necessary to the future development and establishment of the kingdom of God he was profoundly convinced. He took no step either to hasten the catastrophe or to delay it. With the calmest self-possession he allowed events to take their destined course, and it is this repose of mind which most fully illustrates the purity and greatness of his character. To submit to an unforeseen calamity requires neither courage nor wisdom. To meet a fate that is foreseen demands courage, but

[1] See Appendix, Ill. 1 and 2.

does not always show wisdom. It calls for the highest courage and the largest measure of wisdom to see with clear insight a terrible fate approaching, and never to waver in the determination to accept it without a murmur and endure it with perfect confidence.

It was in such a lofty frame of mind that Jesus seated himself at table on the evening of the fourteenth day of the month Nisan with his disciples, in accordance with arrangements previously made, and in a chamber especially prepared for the occasion, with no other witnesses than those who had thus far been his companions in his sufferings, his conflicts, and his successes. The traitor was present with the rest. He proposed to accompany his Master after the Supper to the garden, whither the officers of the men in authority were ordered to go to arrest Jesus. Why did not Jesus expel him from the company? It seems inexplicable. We know of but one possible explanation. The crime was not yet consummated. The traitor might yet be brought to reflection, and the spark of repentance be kindled in his breast, which afterwards, when it was too late, flamed forth within him, a consuming fire. When Jesus, at that last supper, declared that one who was sitting at table with him would betray him, and that it were better for that man if he had not been born,[1] was not this fearful word a last attempt to awaken the slumbering conscience of his disciple?

It was not only, as Jesus well knew, the last Passover that he was to observe, but thenceforth there was to be no Passover to be celebrated any longer. An intimation that this observance of the Passover by

[1] Mark xiv. 18; Matt. xxvi. 23; Luke xxii. 21. This expression is evidently misplaced by Luke after the institution of the Supper.

Jesus was to bring the Feast prescribed by the Old Covenant to an end forever has been preserved in the third Gospel.[1] According to this Gospel, Jesus solemnly declared that he would thenceforth no more eat of *this* Passover, but that it would find its fulfilment in the kingdom of God, i. e. in the new Communion instituted by him. As the Passover, in the Old Covenant, was a feast commemorative of the liberation of Israel from the yoke of heathen oppression, and celebrated in every household, at whose head the father of the house stood as priest, so was this deliverance truly realized only in the New Covenant Communion *by the admission of the Gentiles to the Covenant of God;* and thus was the Old Testament Passover fulfilled. But now, when, notwithstanding this fulfilment, the inauguration of the New Covenant was consecrated by a new symbolical observance, which was to take the place of the Passover, it required to be explained with more precision.

The Passover was essentially an observance through which the theocratic system exercised its influence in the domestic sphere. The principle of theocratic discipline and exclusiveness was at the foundation of it. In this solemnity the people, sanctified to the Lord, united in their family relations in expressing their joy at the mercy shown to Israel. No uncircumcised[2] or unclean person[3] was permitted to take part in the feast. The neglect of it, according to the later construction of the Law, was threatened with death.[4] Thus this observance, otherwise so elevating, was surrounded with the terrors of the Law.

Such a ceremony was wholly at variance with the

[1] Luke xxii. 43.
[2] Exodus xii. 43.
[3] Numbers ix. 7.
[4] Numbers ix. 13.

spirit and character of Jesus. His aim had rather been to break down the narrow limitations of the theocratic statute, to offer salvation to the uncircumcised when they repented and believed, upon the same terms with the circumcised. And he based the future of his kingdom, not on the penal law, but on the tender love of God. His whole public life had been an expression of this love. But only in his death was it fully manifested. His death, and in his death the redeeming, reconciling love of God, which opens the door of the Divine kingdom to the whole Gentile world, — this it was that Jesus now desired to celebrate with his disciples. This whole, deep love could be but partially expressed to the common understanding in a formula, in words. Full expression was to be given to it by a symbolical act, — an act adapted to make all who shared in it partakers in the richest gifts of Divine love.

4. The death of Jesus had become a moral necessity. We have already seen that Jesus had transgressed the theocratic law deliberately and boldly, and engaged in mortal conflict with the hierarchy. This conflict must go on to the end. He could not suspend it, or only partly carry it through. The theocratic system must fall. But this result was possible only on the condition that the champion, who had raised the sword of the Spirit against it, should devote himself to death. He must fall a sacrifice to the Law, that the Law itself might be sacrificed. It was to be made manifest to every honest mind, in the fearful fact of his death, that the law which condemned him was unjust, that a cruel and atrocious legal murder was perpetrated in his case, and that the severities of the law had the effect to destroy whatever was pure and noble, and not preserve it, — to ruin men, not to save them. The

execution of Jesus on the Cross, resolved upon by the constituted authorities, by the Jewish High Council and the Roman Procurator, carried out in conformity with the most cruel and ignominious usages, without mitigation and without humanity, must, in its consequences, affect, not the innocent victim, but the guilt-laden law. The death of Jesus, therefore, to be flung upon his head as at once a curse and a shame, was changed into a source of blessing and honor to him who suffered it. The tender Love, as the representative of which he died, arraigned the inhuman law, the Letter, which killed him. Jesus was acquitted, the law was placed at the bar, and with it the whole theocratic system. The hierarchy was now judged, its law condemned, its fanaticism rendered an object of abhorrence by the Cross, which was exalted into a symbol of innocence, purity, truth, righteousness, love, and freedom. These spiritual forces, the living roots of the kingdom of God, now received the highest honor among the nations, and the dead and deadly letter was consigned to weakness and shame.

Jesus clearly foresaw the effect of his death, and therefore he regarded it as a fountain of salvation to mankind. But he saw in it likewise a means of reconciliation with God and of expiation for our sins. Even under the Old Covenant, reconciliation and atonement were provided in case of a transgression of the law of God, but within very narrow limits. There was no special atonement for the conscious and deliberate violation of the law. According to the Old Testament, there was no expiation possible for the assaults which Jesus had made upon the theocracy. His shameful death as the consequence of a persistent transgression of the Letter was, in the eyes of fanatical Jews, the just

punishment of the great crime which he had committed against the sanctity of their venerated traditions. This death was now to make expiation for the sins of the world. This end it effected, because the blessed consequences flowing from it would annihilate the condemnatory Letter, because it would give it to be known by all mankind that God did not judge sin by the standard of the dead, prescriptive Letter, and because, through that death, the righteousness of God appeared in an entirely new light, as flowing from eternal wisdom and love. In the death of Jesus love triumphed over hatred and the power of the written law, the Spirit over the Letter, truth over hollow appearance, eternal, Divine right over the arbitrary force of human authority. But now, as every true revelation of love is a sacrifice, the death of Jesus, as the highest proof of love that a man could give on earth, is the sacrifice of sacrifices. For love of God and man he offered himself up a sacrifice to the deadly Letter, in order, by his death, to abolish it as the greatest obstacle in the way of true religion and morality.

How natural was it, then, that he should consider his death as the fulfilment of the Old Testament sacrifice, and that, as the Paschal lamb was assuredly, in a certain sense, a lamb of sacrifice, he should appear to himself, in his impending sufferings and death on the Cross, as the Paschal lamb of the New Covenant. It was this idea of his death that floated before his mind during the last observance of the Passover. Hence we may understand what occurred at the conclusion of the meal.

The institution of the Lord's Supper is seen in its true light only in connection with the Old Testament Paschal solemnity, and only as a higher fulfilment

thereof in the New Covenant. What a sacred moment was that, when, at the conclusion of the supper, Jesus took bread, blessed it, broke it, and gave it to his disciples with the words, "Take it, it is my body."[1] Shortly afterwards he took the cup, uttered the prayer of thanks, and handed it to his disciples to drink, with the words, "This is my blood, the blood of the New Covenant shed for many." And he added, he would no more drink of the Paschal wine till he drank the new wine in the kingdom of God. Whether he said anything further at the distribution of the bread and wine is doubtful. It is more probable that tradition has made additions than that one authentic word has been lost. The remark found in the Apostle Paul's account of the Lord's Supper, namely, that the observance was to be repeated in commemoration of the death of Jesus,[2] is a probable addition of the later Apostolic tradition, although it was doubtless the design of Jesus that the New Covenant rite should, like the old ceremony, be repeated from time to time.[3]

To present the new Paschal lamb to his disciples as a symbol, and by this observance to seal the New Covenant in the most solemn manner, in view of his near death, was the purpose of the institution of the Lord's Supper. Bread and wine Jesus regarded as symbols of his own person dedicated on the Cross to the sacrifice of death. As, under the Old Covenant, the Paschal lamb was to be partaken of in order to refresh and strengthen faith in the redeeming power and grace of the Lord, so now the person of Jesus, as the Paschal lamb of the New Covenant, was to be accepted for the refreshment and elevation of the faith of the New Com-

[1] Mark xiv. 22. [2] 1 Cor. xi. 24.
[3] See Appendix, III. 29, p. 240.

munion in the redeeming love of God manifested in him. The Old Covenant rested upon an emphatically legal foundation, and therefore the observance of the Passover was a specially legal observance. The New Covenant had an emphatically moral basis, and therefore the partaking of the Paschal lamb of the New Testament was of a peculiarly moral nature. Bread and wine, therefore, were merely the expressive means whereby was represented what came to pass in the death of Jesus for the salvation of the world. No vainer dispute has been carried on for centuries than that which relates to the words with which the Lord's Supper was instituted: "This is my body," "This is my blood." Jesus, using the Aramæan dialect, omitted the connecting "is." Taking the words to the letter, the conclusion is unavoidable that at that very moment a change took place of the bread into the flesh, and of the wine into the blood of Jesus. But, according to the express declaration of Jesus,[1] flesh and blood as such are nothing. There is only one way of partaking of the Supper that has worth and effect in the kingdom of God: the moral and spiritual appreciation of the sacrifice made for mankind by Jesus on the Cross, of that holy love revealed in his death, of the reconciliation and reunion of sinful man with God.

As the Old Covenant depended upon the stern discipline of the Law, so the New Covenant rests upon voluntary self-devotion, upon the tenderest love. In dedicating the members of his Communion collectively by the Lord's Supper to a free, fraternal union, Jesus impressed upon the body of his disciples its distinguishing character, and its ineffaceable moral significance, its seal from heaven: its distinguishing character, for he

[1] John vi. 63.

grounded it, not upon human prescription, but upon a Divine fact and communication, upon a faith in the free grace of God, which cannot be forced, but lives in the conscience and must be spiritually experienced, and of which the Old Testament theocracy knew nothing and would know nothing; its moral significance, for in the institution of the Lord's Supper he made it plain with impressive simplicity to the members of the Christian body that, as they were grounded in faith in the evidence of God's love, so likewise, bound to one another through the evidence of mutual love, they were to bear themselves and grow in all gentleness, consideration, patience, fidelity, and helpfulness; and, finally, its seal from heaven, for in the Supper he instituted the most intimate communion between himself, accredited as he was by the testimony of his Heavenly Father, and the members of his Communion. He thus showed that his death concerned his followers, not merely as he was an example ever present in their minds as an historical remembrance, but as he was a spiritual source of life and strength, full of inexhaustible power, to be taken into the life of them all, so that they should be forever nourished, quickened, sanctified thereby.

5. Thus, doubtless, Jesus had no purpose but to give a symbolical meaning to the Supper, as the oldest Apostolic tradition represents.[1] He desired to institute it as a means of recalling and refreshing the influences of his death among his followers. It is not upon any formally prescribed acts, it is not upon any church ordinances, that our position before God and our work in the Divine kingdom depend. The Lord's Supper is in itself only an external act. It can easily become a

[1] Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 24.

dead matter of custom. It has become a legal formality throughout the greater part of Christendom to this very day, in opposition to the design, the spirit, the express will of its Founder.

It is evident, from this danger to which the institution is so imminently exposed, that Jesus gave no direct command that its observance should be regularly repeated. He has bequeathed it, as a social ordinance wholly free, to the free use of his followers. As a mere external act, it has no very high object. It must receive moral and spiritual life from the Christian body. The bread and wine in the Lord's Supper are, as we have shown, merely symbols. But symbols as such belong in religion to the period of Law. Until the kingdom of God has reached the period of its full development, it cannot entirely dispense with symbols. It is at the same time, however, the duty of its members to convert the ideas veiled in symbolic forms into spirit and life. The true Communion of the Supper is the Communion in which the sacrifice of Jesus on the Cross has become spirit and life, giving practical evidence toward God and man of the love of Christ which was sealed in his blood. The Lord's Supper is therefore a means whereby the Christian body diffuses an active Christian life through the whole sphere of its influence, and, in manifesting its own loving spirit, lives in conformity to the self-sacrificing love of the Redeemer. If Judas, as is very probable, partook of the Lord's Supper, it is plain that Jesus did not forbid him: the most striking proof possible that all attempts by external discipline to purify the body of participants in the observance from unworthy members are doubtful and worthless.

Since Jesus himself did not exclude from the Com-

munion of the Supper one of whom he said that it would have been better for him had he never been born, it surely is not advisable for us to drive from the table of the Lord such as we, according to our narrow and short-sighted judgment, hold to be unworthy. It must have been deeply painful to Jesus to permit the traitor to take part in the institution of the feast of the New Covenant. If he endured that pain, it could only have been from his desire to preserve the Supper from even the appearance of being a positive and formal observance. He required from those who partook of it no special preparation, nor did he exact a previous confession before the first Communion. Entire freedom was granted to all who joined in it. Thus has Paul also treated the institution: "Let a man examine himself, and so," i. e. after previous, free, personal self-examination, "let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup."[1] What would Jesus have thought of those who make assent to a certain precise, dogmatic formula the indispensable condition of a participation in the Supper? Never before had Jesus stood at so lofty a height as at the moment of instituting this observance. With a violent death before his eyes, expecting from his disciples, in their weakness of character, neither help nor comfort, with no anxiety for victory over men, with his hopes placed only upon his Heavenly Father and upon the truth and power inherent in his great work, and uniting with all this an elevated repose, a still submission, and perfect patience with one who at this very moment was meditating the basest treachery! A brief storm, however, was to rise in this, until now, untroubled calm of his mind.

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 28.

NOTE.

[The reader cannot fail to perceive how little some of the concluding remarks of this chapter correspond with the account which it gives of the greatness and deep significance of the so-called institution of the Lord's Supper. It tells us that Jesus had a very important and deliberate purpose, namely, to provide for his followers, in the most solemn manner, a symbolical representation of himself as the Paschal lamb, sacrificed in consecration of the New Covenant, which abolished and superseded the Old with all its rites. After giving us this account of the Lord's Supper, Dr. Schenkel remarks that, the observance of it may easily become a dead formality, and that it has in fact become such throughout the greater portion of the Christian world. And, finally, he doubts whether it were meant by Jesus to be regularly repeated. It was designed, he says, to promote the spiritual life of the Christian Communion, but it has life, he remarks, only as it receives life from that Communion.

If it were as our author states, if the institution were designed to have the character and meaning which he supposes, the result is most melancholy. But the truth is, Jesus founded no institutions. And herein did he show that consummate and instinctive wisdom for which he stands alone in human history. Institutions, Lord's Suppers, sacraments, and churches have sprung from him and will spring. But Jesus himself instituted nothing of the kind. He left such things to take care of themselves, seeking only to inundate the world with the Spirit and the Life dwelling in him without measure, and flowing forth from his spirit out of its own irrepressible fulness.

That memorable evening, so far from being calmly occupied by Jesus in founding an institution, appears to me to have been an occasion awakening in him deep and painful emotion. Although he was the open and bold opponent of the hierarchy, I find no difficulty in supposing, not only that he observed the venerable feast of the Passover, which must have contracted in time an eminently domestic and social character, but that he had looked forward, as he says, with special interest to this festival, as to the last opportunity that would be given him of being alone with his disciples. (Luke xxii. 15, 16.) But when the evening came, it passed, probably, not as he had anticipated. He had looked to be

cheered by the presence and affection of his friends. But they hardly met before they began to dispute which should be the greatest. (Luke xxii. 24.) Then the meditated treachery of a friend, of which possibly Jesus may have received just before some new confirmation, threw its black shadow over the occasion, not only wounding him deeply, but making him feel more vividly than ever how all alone he was in the world, and the certainty and close nearness of the last awful hour. I do not wonder that institutions, formal commemorations, have claimed their origin from the occurrences of that evening, so profoundly moving as they were. But that any thought of instituting a formal observance crossed the mind of Jesus at such an hour as that, I find it hard to imagine. The special incidents, which are considered to indicate such a purpose on his part, are the breaking of the bread and the pouring out of the wine, represented by him as symbolical of his body and his blood. But have we not here, as I have already had occasion to remark, an instance of that habit of mind, so characteristic of him, which led him constantly to see correspondences between external objects and incidents on the one hand, and his own thoughts and emotions on the other, so that his spirit was always picturing itself in the world around him? How full was he of spiritual thoughts, and how near were they to his heart, how deeply was he interested in them, when nothing could occur in his presence, when a lily could not wave or a sparrow fall without bringing them to mind, and a piece of bread could not be broken without figuring his thought! It was a correspondence of this sort that suddenly suggested itself to him as he broke the bread and poured out the wine. There flashed upon him the striking resemblance between the bread and wine, which nourish and refresh the bodily life, and his body and blood, which were to be given up for the nourishment of men's souls. There occurred to him also the likeness between himself and the lamb sacrificed at the Passover. His blood was to seal a new and better testament. It seems as if it must have been almost with a shudder that he noted the similitude. It struck him so vividly that (the interest of the incident, and the monstrous errors connected with it, justify the repetition) he lost sight of the bread and wine, and saw, in imagination, only his own body lacerated and bleeding. Hence the form of speech that he used, "It is my body!" "It is my blood!" His wounded body and his flowing blood he alone saw. And was it not probably the shock that the resem-

blance gave him that prompted him to tell his disciples to take the wine and divide it among themselves, but that he himself would drink no wine any more? The language of Luke is: "I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God shall come." The first two Evangelists report this same declaration with variations, but they all three have preserved the words, "the fruit of the vine." Is there not a pointed significance in the comprehensiveness of this designation? Does it not seem as if he felt at the moment that he could no more drink wine than he could drink his own blood? The added clause, "until the kingdom of God shall come," or, according to Matthew, "until the day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom"; according to Mark, "until that day that I drink it new in the kingdom of God," appears to be an instance of a Hebrew idiom, in conformity with which a proposition appears to be limited by a circumstance referred to, in order to exclude the idea of limitation. Thus in Matthew's Gospel (xii. 20) we have a quotation from Isaiah: "A bruised reed shall he not break and smoking flax shall he not quench, *till he send forth judgment unto victory*," which evidently means, not that he will break the bruised reed and quench the smoking flax *after* he has sent forth judgment unto victory, but that he will never do these things. See also Job xiv. 12. It was the purpose of Jesus to assure his disciples, not that he would drink wine after the kingdom of Heaven shall come, but that he would never drink it again on earth.

It is observable that neither the first nor the second Gospel contains a word that intimates that Jesus designed to institute a commemorative observance. Luke alone has the words: "Do this in remembrance of me." According to Matthew and Mark, there was nothing formal in what Jesus said and did. It was all purely extemporaneous and occasional. That a formal service commemorative of Jesus, and especially of his death, should have come at once into observance among his followers, lay in the nature of things. And it is equally natural that it should have grown out of this memorable scene, and taken form therefrom. All this was indeed so natural, that the primitive disciples very readily received the impression that Jesus must have given a direct command to this effect, and so the words, found only in Luke, may have been believed to have been uttered by Jesus himself, although neither Matthew nor Mark has preserved any such direction.

According to Dr. Schenkel, the alleged institution of the Supper was of so formal and elaborate a character, that he is under the necessity of supposing that the washing of the disciples' feet must have taken place at an earlier period. But is it not evident that this act was a last lesson? Jesus perceived that all that he had said and done to bring his disciples to renounce their ambitious desires for distinction and cherish a spirit of mutual forbearance, had been but of little avail. They were still full of selfish rivalry. It was only a last opportunity, I conceive, that could have suggested to him this strong way of correcting the temper of his disciples. In order to make an ineffaceable impression on them, to shock them into a sense of the truth, he, their Lord and Master, to whom they looked up with the deepest reverence, discharged for them a low, menial office. Dr. Schenkel finds in the recital of this scene, as it is given in the fourth Gospel, no relation to the death of Jesus, whereas it is deeply overshadowed by that event. And there is no other scene in his history that more truly and touchingly illustrates the tenderness of his human sensibilities, and the characteristic greatness of his mind.

How significant of the reverence with which they regarded him is the silence in which the disciples submitted to the discharge of so low an office by their Master! No one of them made any resistance but Peter, and the few words that passed between him and Jesus, how characteristic in every syllable of each! How human and how tender the reluctance with which Jesus discloses his knowledge of the treachery of a friend! How Godlike the insight with which he discerns the intrinsic glory of his fate when it is brought home to him with new force by the departure of Judas to consummate his purpose! And then how profoundly true to nature is the melting tenderness with which he turned to his disciples, whom he now felt that he was to be with only a little while longer! How humanly does he feel the intolerable burden of suspense, as shown in the "What you mean to do, do quickly," addressed to the traitor. The narrative glows and throbs all through with life.

There is no evidence that the mind of Jesus was so entirely occupied, as our author represents, with a "New Covenant." On the contrary, he appears singularly free from all such Jewish and Judaizing modes of thought. It is but a passing allusion, suggested by the occasion, the Passover, that he makes to the "New Testament," which his blood was to seal. — Trans.]

CHAPTER XXVI.

GETHSEMANE.

1. Jesus rose from supper to make, according to custom, his evening visit to the garden at the foot of the Mount of Olives. He was drawn more strongly than ever at this time to the repose of that still spot and the free presence of nature. He had held a solemn feast, dedicating himself to death, in most intimate communion with his disciples. But had they really understood him? There was still nothing more offensive to them than the thought of pain and death. They were still unable to comprehend why it was necessary that their Master should suffer and die. What will they do when the very next hour the fearful blow shall fall upon his head? To all of them his suffering will be a stumbling-block and an offence. Without heart, without any strength of character, they will turn faithlessly away from him in the hour of peril, — leave him to his fate to save themselves from sharing it with him. Such were the thoughts that moved the soul of Jesus on his way to the garden, and he could not conceal them from the disciples who accompanied him.

They had thus far entirely mistaken their own spirit. They were confident that they possessed all the courage, resolution, readiness to sacrifice themselves, that could be desired. Accordingly they were wounded by the words of Jesus. Their spokesman, Simon Peter, protested in the name and with the assent of them all, their joyful willingness to share the adverse fortunes

of their Master. Such self-delusion in those who had just witnessed the solemn consecration of the New Covenant must have filled the mind of Jesus with still more painful emotions. He felt it to be his imperative duty to tell the self-confident Peter beforehand of the fall which he was to suffer the very next hour. No misgivings, however, were created in the conscience of Peter or in any of his companions. They professed themselves ready to give up their lives for Jesus: big words, loud protestations, and for their fulfilment neither strength nor courage. They were oppressed at this hour as with a mountain's weight. They all felt that the decisive hour was at hand. In such a frame of mind they reached the garden at the foot of the Mount of Olives, whither Judas had hastened on before, and where he directed the officers charged with the execution of the orders of the High Council to meet him; Jesus, on his part, oppressed with a foreboding, not only of the bitter and shameful death that awaited him, but also of the weakness and faithlessness, by which his disciples would be disgraced; the disciples, on their part, in that defiant and presuming temper which, with the most exalted idea of its own performances, unites feeble insight and an untried will.

A profound melancholy had taken possession of the mind of Jesus, and it increased from moment to moment until it became an intense agony, convulsing his inmost soul. The fourth Gospel makes no mention of this mental conflict, as it would not harmonize with the representation which this Gospel gives of Jesus, of his state of mind, and of his bearing in these last hours of his life. Jesus had indeed, according to this Gospel, on the evening of his arrest, a presentiment of his impending violent death. "Only a little while am

I with you," said he to his disciples.[1] To the question of Peter whither he was going, he replied that he was going whither Peter could not follow him then, but would follow him by and by.[2] According to this Gospel, likewise, Peter asseverates that he is ready to lay down his life for Jesus. The Master warns him on this occasion also, and predicts the subsequent denial of Peter. So far the representation of the fourth Gospel follows a tradition kindred to that of Palestine.

But just at the point at which, according to the first three Gospels, agitation and anguish overwhelm the soul of the Redeemer, the fourth Gospel assumes for him a thoroughly self-possessed and imperturbable attitude. "Be not distressed, rely upon God, rely upon me,"[3] he exclaims to his disciples. He is conscious of perfect faith, of a blessed peace, of a wondrous sense of power and victory. "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you; let not your hearts be troubled, neither be afraid."[4] Such is the expression of his state of mind. So little does he himself need to be comforted, that out of the very fulness of his joyous confidence he comforts his disciples. The prince of the world has no further power against him.[5] Death and its horrors are already overcome. His last advance towards death has no purpose but to convince the world that he loves the Father and obeys his commandments.[6] According to the fourth Gospel, it is the disciples only who are sad,[7] but not the Lord. He calls to them from a spirit at peace, whose depths no wave of disquiet disturbed. "Be of good cheer, I have conquered the world."[8] The last hour before his ar-

[1] John xiii. 33. [2] John xiii. 36. [3] John xiv. 1.
[4] John xiv. 27. [5] John xiv. 30. [6] John xiv. 31.
[7] John xvi. 22. [8] John xvi. 33.

rest is here not the hour of his agony, but the hour of his glorification.[1] Hardly does he reach the spot where Judas had agreed to meet the band charged with the office of seizing his person, when he comes upon the traitor and the armed men led by him. But at the very first word with which Jesus announces his presence, the men fall to the ground as if struck by lightning. There arises not the slightest doubt in his mind that he should drink the cup which the Father had given him.[2] With the all-penetrating eye of omniscience he ever saw beforehand what was to befall him. Nothing came to him unexpectedly. There was at no moment any surprise. Everything in regard to his approaching fate had been settled long before in his mind. He has considered and arranged everything. Going, in the full assurance of victory, to meet death, how could he be sad and tremble and be dismayed?

2. In the representation, given us by the fourth Gospel, of the last hours of Jesus before his arrest, there lies unquestionably a deep truth. It shows us Jesus at the height and in the splendor of his moral completeness. But how he rose to this height, — on this point we are left in the dark. The portrait of the Redeemer is here fully depicted in its finest lineaments. The eternal, personal self-revelation of God stands before us in the transfigured form of a human being. The shadows, cast by the weakness of human nature, are effaced from the picture. Such was Jesus in the sacred hour of his transfiguration, in his most exalted moments, when his views were the clearest and his spirit was the most elevated. But such he was not in the moments and hours of his severest struggles, in the fire of temptation. These struggles, this trial,

[1] John xvii. 1. [2] John xviii. 11.

— they were still to be met and borne before the final victory on the Cross. The sacred champion was not to be spared this last proof. The first three Gospels have described the final struggle with a frankness and vividness which allow not a doubt to be entertained of the historical truth of the picture. The Evangelists certainly had no occasion to invent spiritual conflicts for Jesus. There were stronger reasons why the later tradition should be led to avoid the mention of such struggles as actually had place. But that they have not been omitted in the Evangelical narrative is due to the fact that they were authenticated by the direct testimony of the Apostles.

Having reached the Garden of Gethsemane, Jesus felt the need of prayer and of being alone with the most intimate of his disciples. The mental anguish with which he was seized he has himself most strongly expressed in the words, "My soul is sorrowful even unto death."[1] Even the third Evangelist, who, moreover, likewise follows a later tradition, regards these words as offensive and suppresses them.[2] Even to him such distress of mind, such deadly sadness, seems irreconcilable with the exalted repose and serenity which Jesus had just before shown at the institution of the Supper. The common ideas of the Church are quite incompetent to explain the strong emotion evinced by Jesus in the garden. How indeed could the possessor of the Divine nature on earth, the equal of God himself, the second person of the Godhead become man, tremble and be appalled in view of death, which could have no power over the Divinity?

But, even from a human point of view, the question

[1] Mark xiv. 34; Matt. xxvi. 38.

[2] Compare Luke xxii. 40 *et seq.*

arises, Whether such distress as Jesus suffered in Gethsemane be in accord with his otherwise lofty character, whether at that critical moment he did not evince a hesitation, a weakness, although transient, yet not worthy of him. In answering this question, all depends upon discovering the true cause of his extreme emotion.

The nearer the final and decisive hour approached, the more profoundly was he made conscious of his lonely and deserted condition. His heart which beat so warmly with inexhaustible love was now to drink the bitterest cup of human hatred. And when do we feel ourselves more utterly forsaken than when hatred is threatening to destroy us? Thus we are able to understand Jesus when he besought his most intimate disciples, weak indeed as they were, but still not wanting in love for him, to stay with him: "Tarry ye here and watch with me."[1] This truly historical circumstance does not appear in the third Gospel, in which Jesus withdraws from his disciples, who do not watch, but fall asleep, and he returns to them only at the close of his agony to reproach them for their slumbers.[2] The clear foresight of the necessity that was upon him to suffer the extreme consequences of human hatred, crushing him in the eyes of the world, to die covered with contempt and shame and curses, moved his soul to its inmost depths. And now he wrestled with himself and with his God and Father. He flung himself in terrible agony upon the earth, praying repeatedly and with intense fervor, and the purport of his prayer was only this, that "this cup" might, if possible, pass from him. What did he mean by "this cup"? Unquestionably nothing less than the violent suffering and

[1] Matt. xxvi. 38. [2] Luke xxii. 46.

death that awaited him. It was not the sins of his country and of mankind, bringing death to him, the innocent and the pure; it was not the infinite guilt, which, according to the popular idea, he had to expiate by his sufferings and death; it was not the immeasurable punishment, which, according to the same idea, he was to suffer in his death-offering, — it was nothing of this kind that filled his soul with anguish. There is not the slightest hint of the sort in the Evangelical narrative. What oppressed and agonized him was the forefeeling of the horrors and tortures that were close before him. A shrinking purely human, a dread perfectly true to nature, shook his whole being. His soul quivered and quaked with horror at the mortal agonies then at hand, and so terrible and so shameful that no suffering more fearful was to be imagined. It was not the mere physical suffering that was the cause of his distress. It was not death as such, — but to die, condemned as a vile criminal, as a miserable slave, by the highest spiritual and civil authorities, pierced through and through with the arrows of hate, amidst the devilish jeers of his triumphing foes and the cowardly shrieks of his disciples fleeing from the scene of his suffering and his shame: hence his agony, and hence his transient wish that he might not die.

Not for a single instant had Jesus any doubt in regard to the great work of his life. His deep consciousness of the purest aims, of unwearied endeavors and faithful concern for the welfare of mankind, continued ever steadfast. His kingdom was founded, — a kingdom of moral freedom and spiritual glory. But for one moment, might there not come to him the thought whether so dreadful a death were absolutely necessary to the building up and extension of this kingdom? He might

yet perhaps escape the deadly blow. Why should he not then? God could rescue him. He is Almighty. To Him all things are possible.[1] Before Him then he prostrated himself, even in his agony, humbly and submissively. In that hardest hour he yielded himself to the Almighty will in sincere obedience. Only he hid not from his Heavenly Father the wish that his work might be consummated without this mortal sacrifice.

3. The prayer of Jesus that the cup of death might pass from him, if it seemed good to the Divine Will, is attested by the first three Evangelists.[2] What light it sheds upon the character of Jesus! At an early period he had foreseen and foretold his sufferings and death, but not in a supernatural way, as plainly appears from this prayer, not with indubitable certainty. How could he have been disturbed as he was, had he had the certainty of supernatural inspiration? How could he in this case have fallen into such a state of distraction and expressed the wish, not without hope of its fulfilment, that his Heavenly Father would save his life? He had foreseen and foretold his sufferings and death, as, under the then existing circumstances and for the accomplishment of his great aim, an inevitable necessity. He had seen, on the one hand, that the theocratic party would not rest till it had destroyed him. On the other hand, he had early, with clear vision, recognized that his death, under the curse of the Law and laden with dishonor, must put an end to the dominion of the letter over the conscience, and that that dominion must cease as soon as Israel and the nations should appreciate his death, as the death of a righteous man who died for truth, for freedom, and for the salvation of the world. This insight into

[1] Mark xiv. 36. [2] Mark xiv. 36; Matt. xxvi. 39; Luke xxii. 42.

events was now most assuredly dimmed for a moment. Otherwise the doubt never would have arisen in his soul, whether the great end might not be attained without his death, the wish would never have risen to his lips that the cup of death might pass from him. Not sinful, but only human, was the doubt and the wish. They arose simply, although only transiently, from a necessarily limited insight into the illimitable deeps of the Divine counsels, into the heart of the world's spiritual development. And they would not have arisen at all, had not Jesus had a momentary persuasion that his death was not absolutely necessary to the salvation and reconciliation of the world, and that his great work might be a complete whole, full of power unto salvation, even without that violent and terrible result on the Cross.

But even in this transient hesitation the character of Jesus still continues to be a model of submission and patience, of childlike deference to the will of the Father. "Not what I will, but what thou wilt,"[1] he prays; less strikingly according to the first Gospel: "Not *as* I will, but as thou";[2]—an expression of the unconditional surrender of his own will, morally, spiritually limited since it was, to the perfect counsels of the Divine will: an evidence, amidst the tempest that convulsed him, of a sacred repose in the inmost depths of his soul.

Once more had the tempter approached him. Once more had the natural instinct of self-preservation sought to gain the ascendency over the divine instinct of love. Once more would flesh and blood fain assert themselves when the hour came for submitting his whole being to the high purpose of his soul.

[1] Mark xiv. 36. [2] Matt. xxvi. 39.

For a moment the soul of Jesus was shaken. But soon the spirit from above, in this severest assault, conquered the temptation from below, and Jesus stood the test triumphantly.

The later tradition was not satisfied with the unadorned simplicity of the elder narrative. Its embellishments afford us an instructive glimpse into the formation of marvellous stories. An angel must come to strengthen him,[1] who had found his only strength in submission and obedience to the will of God. His sweat is reported to have poured from him during his conflict in the form of drops of blood: an evident exaggeration, by which superficial critics have been betrayed into bold and even unworthy conjectures.[2] The later legend has, moreover, arbitrarily omitted several historical traits which set the purely human character of the scene in a strong light. How greatly is the portrait of Jesus aided by the word with which, in that moment of profound mental suffering, he excuses his disciples, all unprepared as they were for watchfulness and prayer! "The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak."[3] It does not indeed accord with the popular notion of the radical depravity of the spirit that is in man, inherited from the parents of our race. A proverb borrowed probably from the people, it gives us the judgment of Jesus respecting the moral quality of the human heart. And how gently it sounds at the very moment one would have expected a tone of the greatest severity! Thus had Jesus learned to know men in general, ready for good works, but without strength for their performance, without force of mind and without firmness of character. Physical weak-

[1] Luke xxii. 43.

[2] Luke xxii. 44.

[3] Mark xiv. 38; Matt. xxvi. 41.

ness, irresolute good nature, well-disposed half-heartedness, — such is the average character of mankind. The leaders of the hierarchical party did indeed form an exception, the men of the letter, the upholders of official power. Their will was corrupt. They were incorrigible slaves of formulas, which they made a matter of trade to their own advantage, blind tools of ambition and pride, — such had they become through the fanatical pursuit of party ends. These men Jesus had therefore denounced. He called them a brood of serpents. But they had not thus come into the world. They were not always so. They had become what they were by the habitual suppression of the promptings of conscience, by the disabling influence of the spirit of caste, by the deadening force of custom, by minds buried in prejudice and selfishness, by self-love and self-will, whereby they were rendered incapable of receiving any light from others. Mere weakness leaves the heart open, and susceptible of truth and goodness, but there may gradually spring from it the strength of passion and the cunning of malice.

How far away had the disciples already strayed in consequence of their weakness! How self-confident they were! How little of true faith had they as yet manifested! One was contemplating the basest treachery, others of them, even the three whom Jesus most confided in, appeared weak and lukewarm, while the heart of their Master was torn by the deepest anguish. The flesh, physical sloth and self-indulgence, the hankering after ease and comfort, is the prime cause, often unregarded and even fostered by parents and educators, of the sins and vices of men. The flesh had never shown itself in the disciples as the root of evil deeds more plainly than at this moment. The weakness of

the flesh, and a self-seeking disposition, prevented the spirit in them from discharging the duty which they owed to their Master. The life of the Old Testament system had become stiffened into sensuous forms. In sensual excesses the heathen world had squandered its inheritance and lost its original communion with God. This evil spirit from below now threatened to extinguish the moral courage and spiritual strength of the disciples just at the hour when they stood in special need of the light and fire of the spirit from above. Out of this weakness of nature had arisen the storms which so deeply disturbed the soul of Jesus.

4. But in the very moment that the traitor with his companions entered the garden, those storms were allayed. Firm and self-possessed, he went to meet the armed men, who had come to seize his person. All the more striking by contrast was the want of composure and presence of mind shown by the disciples, whom the danger evidently took by surprise. One of them, — Simon Peter, according to the later tradition,[1] — undertook with drawn sword to defend Jesus against this midnight surprise, and wounded a servant of the law on the ear, which, according to the latter legend, was healed by Jesus on the spot.[2] According to the earlier tradition, Jesus seems scarcely to have been aware of this act of his disciple, as unwise as it was ineffectual.[3] In the confusion and darkness, the blow given with the sword and its consequence escaped his notice, and there surely was no time for a conversation between him and his disciple.[4] The falling to the earth also of the men who came to take Jesus is mentioned only by the fourth Gospel, and no satisfactory

[1] John xviii. 10.
[2] Luke xxii. 51.
[3] Mark xiv. 47.
[4] Matt. xxvi. 52.

reason is given for it, as those who fell were instantly on their feet again, and the seizure of Jesus was effected without difficulty.[1] On the other hand, the words spoken by Jesus to the men and their leaders at the moment of his arrest are attested by all the first three Evangelists. The reproachful words, "Are you come out as against a thief, with swords and clubs to take me? I have been daily with you in the Temple teaching, and you took me not,"[2] are fitted far less to a rabble of soldiers who had just been thrown to the ground by a word of power from the lips of Jesus than to officers engaged in the unobstructed execution of the orders which they had received from the authorities. A word of power at which, as the fourth Evangelist relates, his enemies were struck down, although but for a moment, would not at all events be in keeping with the remark of Jesus, that all this was done that the Scripture might be fulfilled,[3] which remark shows how quietly Jesus acquiesced in his now swiftly approaching fate, regarding it as the fulfilment of a divine decree determined upon from eternity, and harboring no doubt that the promise of future glory, made to the suffering righteous in the Old Covenant, would be redeemed in his case likewise. He bowed calmly, therefore, under the yoke of sufferings which were to lead him to final victory and eternal joy.

This consideration, however, does not lessen the guilt of the enemies of Jesus, nor extenuate the violence with which, under the pretence of law, they treated him. He had ground for the gravest complaint. He had reason to protest against the artifice practised against him, which was the more unjustifi-

[1] John xviii. 6. [2] Mark xiv. 48; Matt. xxvi. 55; Luke xxii. 52.
[3] Mark xiv. 41, 49; Matt. xxvi. 56.

able as it was openly and without reserve that he had always followed his convictions. Up to this moment, they had done nothing to check his public career. They had dogged his steps, they had laid snares for him, but had never once attempted to stop him. Now, when the moment seemed favorable, in their want of grounds for proceeding against him they had recourse to violence, and carried out their designs against his life under the cover of night.

An act thus accomplished always exercises a depressing influence upon weak minds. After the arrest of Jesus a panic seized his disciples. They all took to flight,[1] a circumstance which the fourth Gospel, owing to its peculiar point of view, finds no room for;[2] and the third, out of consideration for the Apostles, passes over in silence.[3] The disciples had claimed for themselves a braver faith than they possessed. The person of their Master, seized and dragged away by the servants of power, a picture of the extremest human weakness and of heart-rending grief, filled them in their first surprise with affright and despair. For the moment they gave up his Cause and their own for lost.

[1] Mark xiv. 50; Matt. xxvi. 56.
[2] John xviii. 8.
[3] Luke xxii. 53.

NOTE.

[Dr. Schenkel represents that portion of the fourth Gospel which records the assurances and consolations given by Jesus to his disciples before he went to the garden (see chapters fourteenth to seventeenth inclusive), as inconsistent with the scene of agony presented on that spot, and related by the other three Evangelists. Whereas, as between the Baptism of Jesus and his subsequent Temptation, so between the wonderful strength and generosity of mind evinced in those chapters of the fourth Gospel, and the agony in Gethsemane, I find a connection profoundly historical. That what Jesus said to his disciples is much amplified, and has received a coloring and a style from the glowing feelings of the spiritually-minded author of the fourth Gospel, is in the highest degree probable. That Jesus said everything precisely as it is there set down it is difficult to suppose. But that the spirit of Jesus is there one feels an intuitive conviction, not only because of the Christ-like truth and love which inspire this portion of the Gospel, but because the occasion called for such utterances on the part of Jesus, and he could not have been regardless of it. Let us note the circumstances.

On that last evening so marked was the emotion of Jesus, so impressive were his words and his tones, that his disciples, as I conceive, for the first time fully took in the idea that they were really to be separated from him, and that very soon. They were overwhelmed with dismay and sorrow. So great was their grief, into such a depth of misery were they sunk, under the dark cloud which had all at once gathered round them, veiling all their bright visions in thick night, that Jesus, burdened as he was with the thought of his own awful doom, needing solace far more than they all, put aside all his own mighty griefs, and set himself to comfort these poor terrified weeping friends of his. Saddened as he was, he yet understood what was coming. They were utterly bewildered and lost in the deep darkness. How great their grief was is evident from the tenor of the thoughts which he suggests to cheer and comfort them. So great was their anguish, that they lost sight of the simplest and plainest considerations. "Be not distressed," he says. "Trust in God, trust in me. In my Father's house are many mansions. If it were not so, I would have told you." So plunged in sorrow were they, that they needed to be re-

minded of what to him were ever-present, self-evident truths, — God and immortality. He tells them that they were full of sorrow because he had told them he was going away, that if they loved him, they would rejoice, because he was going to the Father. He assures them that, though he is about to leave them, they will not be forsaken, they will not be as orphans, that still whatever they shall ask of God in his name, i. e. in the spirit which his name represented, they will receive, and that they will have another friend, guide, helper, comforter in his place, — a friend who will never leave them, but be with them always, as he himself could not be, — one who will recall to them all that he had said, and enable them to understand everything; and that other helper was the true spirit that was in them already, and would come to them more and more, and lead them into the knowledge of all truth. Thus talking with them, he leaves the place where they had supped together for the last time, and turns his steps late in the evening to his favorite spot, the Garden of Gethsemane. He seems to have been aware that his whereabouts was known, that his enemies were busy and would soon appear. Arriving at the Garden, he takes with him only his three most intimate disciples into the place. And now having said and done all that was possible, exhausted in a manner by the effort he had made to encourage his friends, in the stillness of the spot and of the night, in the awful suspense of the hour, his mortal nature asserts itself. There comes a natural revulsion of feeling. He is seized with a deadly sickness of the soul. It seems to him, as he tells his disciples, as if he should die. I cannot dare to fathom the depths of that agony. It was his utter loneliness, the profound and appalling solitude, in which he was to encounter the coming horror, that most aggravated the bitterness of that deadly cup. So far as the purposes which were dearest to him and for which he was about to die were concerned, there was not a heart on earth that beat in sympathy with him. His disciples loved him, but far, far were they from understanding him. He wants to be alone, and yet he cannot bear the thought of being out of the reach of human fellowship. He prays his three disciples to remain and keep watch where they are, while he goes off a little distance by himself. All his movements are as of one distraught. He goes apart and throws himself with agonizing ejaculations upon the earth. His disciples catch only a few words. Wearied, exhausted by grief and excitement, they are overcome by sleep.

He returns to them only to find them slumbering. Dismayed, distressed as they were, how little did they appreciate the situation! "Could you not watch with me for one hour?" he exclaims, and then, wrung from his own experience at the moment, come the characteristic words, "Watch and pray, lest ye enter into temptation." With a generous consideration to which no suffering of his own could make him insensible, he suggests an excuse for the unseasonable slumbers of his friends. "The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak." Thus also he found it with himself. Thrice he went apart, thrice he returned to his disciples, turning from man to God, and from God to man, and for a while finding in his agony no relief. It is easy to pronounce the mention of his sweat streaming from him, "as it were blood," a legend. But the question is, What could have given rise to such an idea? May we not suppose that, as he bent over his disciples to arouse them, the sweat fell in such big, heavy drops upon them, that one of them at least, Peter perhaps, who was quick to take such impressions, having his mind filled with vague dreams of violence and death, fancied, in his half-awake state, that the drops of sweat were drops of blood? However this may have been, agonizing as the moment was, the agony was not in vain. It could not overcome — it only strengthened — his disposition to submit himself unreservedly to the Eternal Will. That such was the result appears from the fact that, as soon as he perceived, either by the sound of their footsteps or by the distant light of their lamps and torches, that they whose errand it was to apprehend him were approaching, there is no shadow of weakness. He is wholly himself. So far from showing any wavering, any fear, he goes to meet the armed men. Unexpectedly to them, he presented himself right before them, and inquired whom they were looking for. Struck as by an apparition, they involuntarily started back with such a sudden motion that they fell momentarily into confusion, and some of them were thrown to the ground. Considering the darkness of the hour, the loneliness of the spot, and the rumors everywhere rife of the extraordinary power of him whom they came to seize, and the commanding air which it is impossible to disconnect from his personal presence, could anything be more probable than that they kept so close together that some of them were thrown down, when those in front shrunk back at the sudden appearance in their path of the very man whom they were in search of, and who, as we may infer from their number

and their arms, they expected would endeavor to escape them? And is not this what we are to understand the narrative to mean, where it tells us that, when Jesus declared himself to be the person they were seeking, the men who came to take him "went back and fell to the ground"? Although Jesus gave himself up so fearlessly into the hands of his captors, it was not without a sense of the indignity with which he was treated, as is shown in the few words which he said to them: "Do you come after me with swords and clubs as if I were some miserable thief? You did not dare to lay hands upon me in public and in the daytime. But night is indeed your fit season."

Our author appears to me to overlook a great many particulars, strikingly significant of the character of Jesus, which I would gladly specify here, had I not noted them in previous publications. See *Jesus and his Biographers*, 1838, *and The Veil Partly Lifted*, 1864. — TRANS.]

CHAPTER XXVII.

THE TRIAL.

1. A COMMITTEE of the High Council, composed of persons to be entirely relied upon, were already assembled in nightly session, Caiaphas presiding; and witnesses also had been summoned in all haste. Jesus was to be speedily examined, the case brought to a conclusion with all possible despatch, and the sentence of death executed at once.[1] Only Jewish witnesses appear to have been called. The earlier part of the career of Jesus in Galilee, comparatively quieter than at a later period, was not brought under notice. It is remarkable that entire unanimity, such as the Law required,[2] could not be obtained from the witnesses. They evidently were not suborned; for, had they been,

[1] Mark xiv. 55; Matt. xxvi. 59. [2] Deut. xvii. 6; xix. 15.

the desired unanimity would have been secured. Several of them, however, appear to have agreed in stating that Jesus had publicly declared that he would destroy the Temple made with hands and in three days build a new temple not made with hands.[1] Why the Evangelists pronounce this testimony false is not easy to see, as Jesus had undoubtedly used very nearly these words. It can only have been the construction, which both witnesses and judges put upon them, that was false. Jesus did not, as the fourth Gospel supposes, speak symbolically, and mean, by the temple destroyed and built again, his own body crucified and risen,[2] but he had reference to the actual Herodian Temple as the centre of the Old Testament theocracy. It was this that, in the consciousness of his Messianic authority, he intended to say that he would speedily put an end to, and establish in its place a new Temple, the Communion of his followers built up by the word and the spirit of God. What he said about building the temple in the space of three days was taken by one and another of his hearers to the letter, and understood as a vainglorious assertion that he would destroy the Herodian Temple, and in three days, as with a magician's wand, erect a far more splendid temple in its place. Had he made any such pretensions he would have confessed himself, not only a fanatical destroyer of the Sanctuary, but a boaster vaunting the possession of omnipotence. The witnesses, however, do not appear to have agreed as to this understanding of his words. One took them literally, another had a tolerably correct idea of their meaning. According to the fourth Evangelist, whose representation of this particular is entirely credible,

[1] Mark xiv. 58; Matt. xxvi. 61. [2] John ii. 19.

Jesus spoke these words upon the occasion of driving the traders from the Temple. He had at that time publicly and irrevocably broken with the external forms of the theocracy; and doubtless he said, in connection with these words, what he understood by the true Temple and the worship of God in spirit and in truth. Those words, rightly understood, were also a declaration of war against traditional Judaism and its supporters, the hierarchical party. He who foretold, as the necessary consequence of his life and work, the destruction of the visible temple, with which all the memories and hopes of pious Israelites were associated, — he who promised to build up in its place into an invisible temple the great body of the people, who, under the Old Covenant, were the wards of the guardians of the external temple service, — he stood forth in the sharpest antagonism to the time-honored traditions of Judaism and to all its formulas and usages; he boldly and peremptorily summoned the spiritual authorities to the protection and vindication of their alleged sanctities which were thus threatened.

If, however, the presiding officer of the Council were not fully satisfied with the testimony, he had reason for his dissatisfaction in the fact that the declaration of Jesus concerning the approaching destruction of the Temple contained no direct assertion of the office to which Jesus laid claim. It was necessary that the members of the High Council, conducting the examination, should ascertain directly whether Jesus really demanded to be acknowledged as the Messiah. He had avowed himself as such mostly among his intimate friends, and only towards the close of his public career. Whether he would now, in the presence of the supreme spiritual authorities of Israel,

proclaim himself the Messiah, was the question. To make this point certain, all depended upon his judges. If that pretension should be avowed by him, then it would be proved that he was dangerous to the state, as well as a fanatic in religion, and the Roman authorities in Jerusalem would have just as great an interest in condemning him to death as the Jewish spiritual court. The presiding High-Priest was resolved to bring the matter to a speedy end. He demanded of Jesus a direct answer to a simple question. He asked him whether he regarded himself as the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed.[1] That this question was put amidst a storm of excitement at a sitting of the High Council held the following morning, as the third Gospel reports,[2] is unlikely. The hearing in the night had this very purpose, — to force from Jesus the necessary confession, which might be laid before the public meeting of the High Council on the morrow.

Under the circumstances, Jesus could not but answer the question of the High-Priest. He had held his peace when conflicting witnesses were putting a false construction upon what he had said. For, to prove that he had not been understood, would have led him too far away; and his irreconcilable opposition to the theocracy — the very point of the testimony — would, at all events, have to be admitted. To have declined answering the High-Priest would have been equivalent to a renunciation of his Messiahship. There came therefore from his lips the decisive, "I am the Messiah," and the asseveration that his judges "would yet see him at the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven."[3] These last words are evi-

[1] Mark xiv. 61; Matt. xxvi. 63. [2] Luke xxii. 66.
[3] Mark xiv. 62; Matt. xxvi. 64.

dently not to be understood to the letter. Jesus here expresses, in the most impressive manner, his conviction that the dominion, the kingdom of the future is his, that he is the true king, in spirit and in truth, not only of Israel, but of all mankind, and that his enemies, who are now triumphing over him for the moment, will be obliged to bow before his royal power.

The party in the High Council, hostile to Jesus, had now gained their end. The horror shown by the High-Priest at the declaration of Jesus was not altogether feigned. That declaration, from the theocratic point of view, at which the High-Priest, the head of the Spiritual Council, stood, might easily be considered a contempt of the consecrated institutions and statutes of Judaism. There stood there in the presence of the highest spiritual dignities of Israel, the guardians of the venerable Law, a man claiming to be king of Israel, — a man without crown or sceptre, without army or power, with only a little company of followers from the lowest class of the people. Did not this look like contempt cast upon the present and the future of Israel? Was it not blaspheming God, whose Son the accused pretended to be? What need was there to hear any more witnesses? He had convicted himself. He had blasphemed. He had incurred the penalty of death according to the ancient Law, although the Law had now for some time been mitigated in practice.[1] As a sign of the greatness of the crime, the presiding Priest rent his garments, and a wild cry of horror filled the hall. Jesus was pronounced guilty. His fate was decided. Hence the brutal and shameful treatment, which he was allowed to receive at the hands of the

[1] Levit. xxiv. 16.

retainers of the Court, and which lasted from the breaking up of the sitting till the dawn of day.[1]

2. In the mean while an incident occurred in the court of the building where the High Council were assembled, which forms a most striking contrast to the fearless confession made by Jesus in the presence of those high dignities. Simon Peter, having recovered somewhat from his first fright, had followed his Master, sincerely sympathizing with him, doubtless, to the court of the hall. But he had not yet regained his self-possession. When a maid-servant recognized in him an adherent of Jesus his courage instantly died away. He boldly denied his connection with Jesus. And when others also made the same charge against him, he undertook even with an oath to clear himself from the suspicion of being a friend of Jesus.[2] What a contrast between the direct, fearless confession of Jesus in the face of inevitable death, and the weak, cowardly denial of his disciple, intent only upon saving his life, and a little while before so loud in his protestations of fidelity! There, in the moment of the greatest danger, is seen the greatest strength of character, here, the most shameful weakness. Jesus could rely upon the inexhaustible fulness of his own spiritual power, upon his own strength of character; but the instruments he had chosen had shown themselves up to this moment and at this critical hour utterly incompetent.

Jesus was happily spared the pain of witnessing the shame of Peter with his own eyes. That at the second cock-crowing he turned a reproachful look upon Peter,

[1] Mark xiv. 65; Matt. xxvi. 67.

[2] Mark xiv. 66; Matt. xxvi. 69; Luke xxii. 56, who is the most minute.

is a legendary addition of the later tradition.[1] Jesus was not in the court of the building while that scene was going on. He was examined and guarded within, and all communication between him and his disciples was necessarily cut off. His condemnation was now decided upon, although only in a shape to be acted upon by the full Council who were called together during the night to a sitting, to be held at daybreak. The result of the hearing in the night was laid before them. The assembly, in conformity with the proposal and motion of the president, Caiaphas, were unanimous in condemning to death the "blasphemer" and "destroyer of the law of their fathers." Jesus, as a condemned criminal of the worst description, was bound and handed over to the Roman Procurator, without whose order the sentence of death could not be executed.[2] Herein the first three Gospels are agreed: on the evening of the 14th the arrest, in the night of the 14th–15th the hearing before a deputation of the High Council, and on the morning of the 15th a full public meeting of the High Council and the formal sentence of death, upon the ground of the result of the previous examination. But the account of the fourth Gospel is not clear. In this Gospel mention is made of a hearing had before the father-in-law of Caiaphas, the High-Priest Annas, which, however, led to no conclusion, and in which Jesus is stated to have returned only an evasive answer to a question put to him respecting his disciples and his teaching. When Jesus, in answer to Annas, bade him seek the information he desired among those who had heard him, there followed, it is said, a very rude assault upon him, whereupon he is led away to Cai-

[1] Luke xxii. 61. [2] Mark xv. 1; Matt. xxvii. 1; Luke xxiii. 1.

aphas, and the hearing before Annas is thus abruptly broken off.[1] Of a second hearing before Caiaphas the fourth Gospel says nothing.[2] This Evangelist appears to have attached special importance to the fact that Jesus made the distinct confession of his Messiahship, not before the Jewish High Council, but before the Roman Procurator. Here seems to be the reason why he represents Jesus as passing the night before his final condemnation in the dwelling of Annas (who was at that time clothed with no official authority), and taken in the morning to Pilate, without any further proceedings before the presiding officer of the High Council. But how much more likely is it that Jesus underwent a hasty examination in the night before a deputation of the Council, and that his formal condemnation followed in the morning at a full meeting of the spiritual authorities?[3]

3. The result of the examination held in the night was doubtless communicated in due form to the Procurator, Pontius Pilate. That such a communication had been made to him is implied in the question — expressive, by the way, of his contempt of Judaism — which he asked Jesus, whether he were the Jews' king, i. e. the pretended Messiah.[4] Here is apparent the particular ground upon which the High Council had condemned Jesus. They had pronounced him deserving of death, under the pretence that he had assumed the office of the Jewish Messiah. The fourth Gospel tells the story differently. It states that Pilate inquired of the "Jews" the ground of complaint;[5] a

[1] John xviii. 13–22. [2] John xviii. 28.
[3] See Appendix, Ill. 30, p. 273.
[4] Mark xv. 2; Matt. xxvii. 11; Luke xxiii. 3.
[5] John xviii. 29.

statement evidently resting upon the erroneous supposition that there had been no decisive examination of Jesus in the night, no formal sentence of death passed by the High Council in the morning, and no confirmation of the same required of Pilate. If, according to the first and second Evangelists, Jesus returned a simple affirmative to Pilate's first question as to his Messiahship, allowing all further questions to go unanswered, the reason of his silence is to be found in the fact that he could not suppose the Roman magistrate and man of the world to have the slightest understanding of the case. According to the fourth Gospel, on the other hand, Jesus does not by any means remain silent when questioned by Pilate. His utterances are of the loftiest import; and he describes to the Roman Procurator the super-worldly nature of his kingdom and the moral glory of his kingship.[1] The language ascribed to him is unquestionably fully worthy of him, and, it is very probable, was uttered by him on some other occasion and in another connection. But he could not have spoken thus, as the fourth Gospel relates, on this occasion, according to the manifestly trustworthy reports of the first three Gospels and the personal and official position of the Procurator in relation to Jesus. There is no reason whatever for withholding faith from the express assertion of the first three Evangelists, namely that Jesus gave Pilate no further answer.[2]

In this silence there was the mute eloquence of a man whose cause needed no advocate before his temporal and spiritual judges. In this court his case was

[1] John xviii. 34.

[2] Mark xv. 5; Matt. xxvii. 14; Luke also (xxiii. 2) knows nothing of any further reply made by Jesus to Pilate.

closed. The ecclesiastical statute, the civil law, condemned him. According to the strict Jewish law, he was an evil-doer, and in the eye of the Roman law, a seducer of the people. He could free himself from the suspicion of being dangerous to the state only by being utterly false to himself and to his cause, should he retract the free and voluntary confession of his Messiahship, which he had made before the High-Priest. Pilate would perhaps not unwillingly have saved him. According to Josephus, he was neither bloodthirsty nor cruel. When the military standards, bearing the image of the emperor, gave offence to the Jews in the City of the Temple, he removed them at their request. He did not willingly expose himself without necessity to the suspicion of bloody-minded severity.[1] He had probably heard of Jesus before, and he had been represented to him as a man politically harmless. The hatred of Jesus manifested by the hierarchy was no reason in the estimation of Pilate why Jesus should be condemned to death, for the hierarchy were by no means well disposed towards the Roman supremacy. Most probably he saw in Jesus a religious enthusiast who might disturb the public peace. At all events, another, a seditious individual, then in confinement, appeared to him as really dangerous. Hence his attempt to persuade the people to favor Jesus as the state-prisoner to be set at liberty according to an established custom upon the occasion of the Passover, an attempt which led the hierarchical party to make counter-efforts in behalf of Barabbas. The steps Pilate took in favor of Jesus could not have been very earnestly meant. From his point of view, as a man of the world, he must have despised a man

[1] Josephus, Ant. XVIII. 3. 1; 4. 1.

of the people in Jesus, and with scorn upon his lips, he ratified the sentence of death pronounced by the High Council.[1] How little he thought of treating the condemned man with mercy is shown in his consenting to deliver him over to the cruel and ignominious punishment of crucifixion.

While the High Council were importuning Pilate to ratify the sentence of death, Jesus maintained perfect composure. He made not the slightest attempt to beg or purchase his life of the magistrate. Whether by referring the people to the tribunal of Herod Antipas Pilate really sought to withdraw himself from the affair is doubtful. This episode is mentioned only by the third Evangelist, and it does not agree well with the jealous watch which the Roman authorities kept upon the Jewish princes.[2] But tradition, in the narrative of this incident in the third Gospel, preserves the idea that Jesus made not the slightest sacrifice of the dignity of his character, and that to the questions put to him he answered only with an impressive silence.[3]

If the fourth Gospel places the character of Jesus in a different light, if he is there represented as most ready to speak to Pilate, as referring the Procurator from his earthly judgment-seat to the Supreme Source of all power and authority, and as, moreover, excusing Pilate in comparison with the hierarchical party,[4] it is because it was the evident aim of this Gospel to make Pilate, as the representative of the Gentile power, appear in a favorable light compared with the Jewish authorities from whom the bloody sentence had proceeded.

[1] Mark xv. 12; Matt. xxvii. 22.
[2] Luke xxiii. 7 *et seq.*, and Appendix, Ill. 31, p. 276.
[3] Luke xxiii. 9.
[4] John xix. 11.

4. In other respects also, the conduct of Pilate, according to the fourth Gospel, is not free from peculiarities. While, according to the first two Evangelists, he made only one attempt, and according to the third Evangelist only two attempts, according to the fourth he made four attempts to persuade the people to show mercy to Jesus. He first tried, according to this Gospel, to induce the Jewish judges to take the case in their hands and settle it by their law, whereupon they reminded him of what it was not creditable to a Roman official to need to be informed of, that the Roman Law did not grant them liberty to execute a sentence of death.[1] He then endeavored by repeated assertions of the innocence of Jesus to move the "Jews" to set him free instead of Barabbas.[2] When this attempt proved unsuccessful he still persisted in his exertions to soften the Jewish opponents of Jesus, and caused him to be most cruelly treated in order to awaken the pity of his foes,[3] a proceeding that certainly evinces no very deep knowledge of the human heart. Finally, he tried to touch the chords of patriotic feeling in the breasts of the Jewish judges of Jesus by representing to them the disgrace to their national dignity of the public crucifixion of a pretended Jewish king.[4]

It is the evident tendency of this representation, far more than that of the first three Gospels, to throw the chief guilt of the execution of Jesus upon the Jews, and upon the hierarchical party in particular. But in carrying out this purpose, this Gospel places the character of Pilate in a very ambiguous, and, historically considered, unintelligible light. That a high Roman officer of State should so emphatically pro-

[1] John xviii. 31.
[2] John xviii. 38.
[3] John xix. 5.
[4] John xix. 15.

claim the innocence of a man condemned to death, that he, in whose power it was, by a simple veto of the sentence, to save the prisoner and protect the right, should make so many fruitless efforts to induce those inferior judges to reverse their decision, that, finally, against his better knowledge and conscience, he should ratify the judgment of a subordinate court, — all this is certainly not very probable. It is only the oldest tradition — Mark's — which preserves its credibility throughout in the account of Pilate's dealing with the case. Pilate saw through the party spirit of the hierarchy.[1] He would fain have saved Jesus, but without offence to the priests, without loss of popular favor. Since his attack upon the Temple, the adherents of Jesus had become intimidated. The fanatical party of the old faith were embittered to the last degree, and Pilate, after the failure of his one attempt to save Jesus by trying to induce the people to ask for his liberation, hesitated not a moment longer, but suffered himself to be a willing tool in the hands of the priests.[2] He was willing "to content" the people. The startling dream of the wife of Pilate,[3] and the scene of Pilate's washing his hands in sign of his throwing off from himself, notwithstanding his ratification of the death sentence, all share in the guilt of putting an innocent man to death,[4] are additions made by the first Evangelist for the purpose of laying a heavier burthen on the hierarchy. As the later tradition has thus depicted the character of Pilate in colors all too fair, so, on the other hand, the personal greatness of Jesus is let down from its purely historical

[1] Mark xv. 10. He saw that the hierarchy had delivered Jesus to him through "envy."

[2] Mark xv. 15. [3] Matt. xxvii. 19. [4] Matt. xxvii. 24.

height. According to the older tradition, Jesus answered Pilate, when Pilate asked him whether he were the Messiah, just as he answered the same question before the High Council, with a simple affirmative, not a syllable more.[1]

This silence before his heathen judge, who had neither any clear understanding of the nature of the charge brought against Jesus, nor any disposition to inquire into it, was the most dignified course that Jesus could have chosen. Conscious as he was of his position, he was no less humble. He would neither justify nor excuse himself; and it is not likely that, in order to impose a heavier guilt upon his hierarchical opposers, he would relieve a man of the world like Pilate of his share of the responsibility.[2] But, all circumstances considered, his emphatic condemnation of his Jewish judges would be irreconcilable with the declaration that the authors of his death acted in ignorance.[3] His silence was no dumb insensibility or defiant pride, but moral self-possession and calm dignity. No needless word, liable to be misconstrued and turned into ridicule, should in the last hours of his life escape his pure lips. In mute patience, in still submission he was to bear his fearful doom as the inevitable consequence of the irreconcilable difference between the Communion of the Spirit instituted by him in truth, freedom, righteousness, and love, and the Communion of the Letter founded by the hierarchy in external discipline, in artificial observances, in blind subjection, in fiery fanaticism.

[1] Mark xv. 5; Matt. xxvii. 14. [2] John xix. 11.
[3] Luke xxiii. 34.

NOTE.

[NOTWITHSTANDING Dr. Schenkel's distrust and rejection of the historical character of many of the incidents relating to Pilate in the Trial of Jesus, I am free to confess that I know not where to look for an historical portrait more consistent in all its features, and more life-like than the portrait of the Procurator as it is undesignedly drawn in the four Gospels, and as it is rendered vivid by the very incidents which our author regards as involving manifest inconsistencies. It appears to me we should have but a feeble foundation for the credibility of any portion of the history, if such incidents are mere legendary additions, as our author states. And furthermore, because a certain definite conclusion may be drawn from a narrative of facts, it does not by any means follow of necessity that the author of the narrative had only that conclusion in view and was so bent upon making it conspicuous that he colored and fabricated facts for the purpose. It is possible after all that he may have had no purpose but to tell the truth. Thus Dr. Schenkel thinks that the fourth Evangelist aimed to hold the Jewish hierarchy chiefly responsible for the death of Jesus. But was it not true that the Jewish priests were the chief criminals? Upon any telling of the story, is this anything more than the plain truth? Where is the need then of supposing that the Evangelist had any other object than the truth?

In reading these different accounts of the Trial, there is one important fact, which Dr. Schenkel does not take into consideration, but which must be brought fully into sight if we are to have any adequate idea of the scene. It is a fact, it is true, which is not directly referred to in the narrative, for the simple reason that its influence, none the less powerful but the more so on this account, was an unconscious influence, a fact definable at the very best only in a degree, but not definable at all in any language which the unpractised authors of the Evangelical accounts had at their command; a fact, that was rather felt in its effects than perceived in itself. I refer to *the personal presence of Jesus*, the power of which is to be constantly kept in view, if we are to have any appreciation of the reality, the life, of his history. But in no part or scene of his history is the recognition of it so important as in these last scenes, and most particularly on the occasion of his arraignment before

the Roman Procurator. It stands to reason, that if there is any power in the human countenance, in the eye, in the voice, in the whole air and manner of a man, that power must have been manifested in Jesus in the very highest degree. For when was there ever a man so moved by exalted purposes, so profoundly in earnest, so full of the light and life of God, as he was on all occasions, but most especially in those last trying hours? There is no necessity of claiming for him extraordinary personal beauty and grace. The indwelling spirit, glowing with the grandest truth and the purest love, must have given an expression to his features, a light to his eye, a music to his voice, and a power to his whole presence, which must have riveted attention upon him, and wrought like a spell upon whatever sensibility lingered in the hearts of the people around him. Upon no occasion was his native greatness more conspicuous than when he stood on trial for his life before the Roman Governor. Then all his great soul was shown, not in what he said, although the few words that he is recorded to have uttered became him grandly, but in that wondrous silence, a silence kept by him not because he had nothing to say, not because he could not have vindicated himself before righteous judges at once triumphantly against all that his accusers had to say, not because, as our author gives us to understand, he had made himself justly responsible to the theocratic law, but because, understanding thoroughly the persons with whom he was confronted and who had his life in their hands, seeing that they were no more capable of listening to truth and humanity than so many hungry wolves, that whatever he might say would just as certainly be disregarded or perverted as had been all that he had already said and done, — seeing this with a clearness of vision which no self-concern could dim, he felt intuitively that perfect silence on his part fitted the circumstances and the hour. He kept silent, in fine, because he knew as well when to hold his peace as when to speak, and no word that he ever uttered was fuller of inspiration than that silence; no, not even does that lofty declaration to Pilate, "Yes, I am a king, and every true man is my subject," show a more regal dignity of mind. From every feature, from his whole person it spoke, spoke of a world of power in him, power to rise above all personal considerations, and, under the most terrible circumstances, to find entire serenity in the perfect possession of himself.

The Roman Procurator, the only one present whose vision was

not blinded by prejudice, was evidently struck by the bearing of Jesus. How could he possibly have helped being so? And he reveals the impression which the prisoner made upon him in his repeated efforts, not to save the life of Jesus as it is termed, but to escape himself from the responsibility of condemning to death one whose whole manner and appearance struck him with a sense of the presence of a power which he could not understand, with awe and indefinable dread. Is there anything plainer than that Pilate was a weak man, wholly unequal to the emergency? And as a weak man, he was peculiarly susceptible of the impression of power, which the bearing of Jesus must have made. Not that he had the slightest insight into the lofty nature of that power. His very ignorance of it served only, by creating a feeling of mystery, to heighten the effect of it upon his mind. Added to this, the alleged high pretensions of this unknown person, the rumors which Pilate doubtless had some knowledge of respecting the career of Jesus, — all united to make the Procurator, weak man that he was, shrink from having anything to do with putting Jesus to death. Dr. Schenkel thinks that Pilate made one attempt to save Jesus. In truth he made no attempt to save Jesus. But that he should have made only one attempt to save himself would be far stranger than that he made so many attempts to extricate himself from a responsibility which the appearance of the prisoner caused him to tremble at. If he made one attempt to evade his responsibility, the uneasy feeling that prompted it would not be likely to be allayed by the failure of that attempt, but increased rather. The very vagueness of the feeling that had come over him, if not adequately understood, would have required more strength of mind than Pilate possessed to overcome it in any other way than as it was finally overcome, namely, by a stronger fear, the fear of Cæsar. First he would have the Jews do the deed, although he knew what they told him, that they had no authority to put Jesus to death. Our author seems to consider this suggestion of Pilate's unlikely, because it was not creditable to a Roman governor to need to be told that the Jews had not the supreme authority. But distasteful propositions are very apt to be made by weak men in the predicament in which Pilate felt himself to be. Hearing next that Jesus was a Galilean, he seized upon the opportunity of sending him to Herod, with the double hope that that prince would dispose of the case, and would also regard the rel-

erence of it to his tribunal as a friendly overture on the part of Pilate, there being, as is recorded, a quarrel between the two at the time. With all the jealousy, to which Dr. Schenkel alludes, with which the Roman authorities kept watch over the Jewish princes, a case might very possibly occur, like that of Pilate and Herod Antipas, in which the Roman official might be personally the weaker of the two, and precisely such relations might arise as appear to have existed between the Procurator and Herod. This attempt to have the matter settled by Herod failing, with characteristic weakness Pilate next tried to persuade the people to ask that Jesus might be liberated rather than Barabbas. This device also proving fruitless, Pilate caused Jesus, innocent as he declared him to be, to be subjected to the cruelty of the Roman scourge, which shows how little any feeling of humanity had to do with these efforts of Pilate to evade the necessity of dooming Jesus to death. He evidently condemned Jesus to be scourged, as our author states, with the hope that this would content the priests. For after Jesus had been scourged, Pilate caused him to be led forth covered with blood and barbarous ridicule, and called attention to him, bidding the people look at him and see what a miserable object he was and how little to be feared. But the sight only whetted the bloodthirsty appetite of the implacable enemies of the prisoner, because Pilate showed by this concession that he could be finally overcome. Because it had this obvious effect and showed so little "knowledge of the human heart," Dr. Schenkel appears to think it not likely that the scourging took place, as if it were an improbable thing that Pilate should not have known the human heart. Why, have we not had in this enlightened nineteenth Christian century a whole great nation of Pilates, who, for thirty years kept scourging the slave with Fugitive slave laws and I know not what other accursed enactments, with the ignorant hope of contenting the Slave Power, and inducing it to abate its cruel demands? Our author appears also to think the scourging an improbable incident, because, according to the testimony of Josephus, Pilate was not a cruel man. He may not have been of a cruel disposition, but fear, selfish fear will extinguish even in the tender-hearted every particle of mercy, and Pilate was on this memorable occasion the slave of his fears. When the Jews menaced Pilate, still hesitating to pronounce the fatal word, with the displeasure of Cæsar, (the reigning Cæsar was Tiberius, the most suspicious, and conse-

quently the most merciless of tyrants,) then Pilate gave way and yielded himself, a weak but reluctant tool to their bloody purpose. One more wretched effort he made to escape the responsibility of the murderous deed. I imagine there was very much less of formality in the washing of his hands before the people than would seem at first sight from the simple language of the narrative. Dr. Schenkel finds difficulty in crediting it, but it was probably the act of a moment. The water, we may suppose, was standing by, and Pilate dipped his hands in it and dashed it off to signify that he had nothing to do with shedding the blood of Jesus. The act was expressive enough, but how characteristic of the weak man that Pilate had shown himself to be throughout! Finally, we have the last finishing touch to the portraiture of Pilate's weakness in the obstinacy with which he insisted upon inscribing on the Cross: "Jesus of Nazareth, *the King of the Jews*," an inscription evidently dictated by the Procurator's desire to revenge himself for the conscious self-humiliation to which the Jewish priests had forced him to submit, by casting ridicule upon them, and representing a miserable crucified man as their king. Dr. Schenkel sees nothing more in this inscription than an official act of the Roman authorities.

I see no reason to discredit the statement that the wife of Pilate sent word to him during the trial to beware how he condemned the person brought before him, as she had had a remarkable dream concerning him. Dr. Schenkel (see first note in his Appendix) thinks the dream a miracle. That the sensation caused by the wonderful career of Jesus reached even the household of the Roman Procurator is no more than probable. The Roman lady possibly had Jewish maidens in attendance upon her, and from them she may have heard such stories of Jesus as excited her imagination and occasioned the dream which startled her so much. At any other moment, her husband, a man of the world and probably a freethinker, would have ridiculed the idea of giving heed to an idle dream. But the message of his wife, coming to him precisely at that juncture, no doubt increased the apprehensions by which he was embarrassed.

Through the whole scene Jesus stood there uttering not a syllable in self-defence, with all those faces of malignity and hatred glaring upon him, and those horrid cries for his crucifixion ringing in his ears. To the priests and their charges he said nothing. He no more thought of expostulating or reasoning with them

than with so many wild beasts. Their bloody purpose was altogether too plain. He could not, for his life, demean himself to waste upon them a single word. Even when Pilate called his attention to what they were saying, he would not open his lips. He spoke to Pilate when Pilate spoke to him until, after declaring him innocent, Pilate commanded him to be scourged. But after that act, which showed Pilate to be utterly regardless of justice and humanity, Jesus refused to speak to him also. It was, he saw, a mere waste of words. The question which Pilate put to Jesus just before he condemned him to death discloses the state of Pilate's mind: "Whence art thou?" i. e. "Who are you? Where do you come from?" showing the curiosity concerning him, which was awakened in Pilate. When Jesus refused to answer, Pilate threatened him with his power. Then Jesus spoke, but not to gratify Pilate's curiosity, not in answer to his question, but to tell him that he had no power of his own, that others were the chief actors in the scene.

Dr. Schenkel questions the credibility of Luke's statement (ch. xxii. 61) that when Peter denied his Master, "Jesus turned and looked upon him." The circumstance is too slight and too characteristic to be regarded as a mere legendary embellishment. The only reason given for regarding it as such is that Peter was in the outer court of the High-Priest's mansion while Jesus was within. But the narrative is in no instance so exact as to require us to allow considerations of this kind to weigh against the moral harmonies of the history. It is not impossible that Jesus may have been led into the outer court where Peter was, just as the terrified disciple was making his last denial of all knowledge of him. (See John xviii. 25 – 28.)

Our author, erroneously as I think, regards the prayer of Jesus, "Father, forgive them, they know not what they are doing" (Luke xxiii. 34), as referring to the priests, the authors of his condemnation. But it is more natural, since the connection authorizes it, to suppose that this ejaculation was wrung from him by the extreme torture to which he was put when they were nailing him to the Cross, and had reference to his immediate executioners, those Roman soldiers, as ignorant as they were barbarous. No physical agony could abate the unconquerable generosity of his mind.

Dr. Schenkel gives implicit credit to the statement of the first two Evangelists, that Jesus declared to the High-Priest and the

other members of the High Council present, that he was the Messiah, and that thereafter they would see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven. (Matt. xxvi. 60; Mark xiv. 62.) But if, as Dr. Schenkel intimates (p. 468), all communication between Jesus and his disciples was cut off during his examination before the High-Priest, the report of what Jesus said on the occasion is to be received with great distrust, as it comes to us only through his enemies. That he was, perversely or otherwise, understood to have confessed himself the Messiah is certain. But if he made the declaration, which is found in the first two Gospels, it is not easily to be explained why it is wanting in the fourth Gospel, the avowed purpose of which was to prove that Jesus was the Messiah. (John xxi. 31.) — TRANS.]

CHAPTER XXVIII.

THE CRUCIFIXION.

1. AFTER the ratification of the sentence by Pilate, its execution was instantly ordered to take place on the pillar of the cross. The execution was conducted with all the unfeeling harshness and extreme barbarity with which heathen Rome was wont to treat its victims. Jesus was first given up to the mockery of the Roman soldiers. What Pilate did not permit — as the fourth Gospel erroneously reports[1] — so long as he held Jesus guiltless, was now allowed. The cause of his condemnation — his pretension to the royal dignity of the Messiah — gave his executioners the occasion which they coveted of the cruellest ridicule. The whole guard, stationed in the government quarters, were called together that they might give

[1] John xix. 2.

free play to their savage love of wanton mischief upon the Jewish rebel and fanatic. With grinning scorn royal honors were paid to his person. A soldier's cloak was thrown over him for a regal mantle. They twisted round his head a crown of thorny stems. The soldiers did homage to him in derision. They forced him to hold a reed in his hand for a sceptre, and then they snatched it from him and struck him with it to make him feel the wretched condition to which he was reduced. They spat in his face and tried upon him all the rude jests of a coarse soldier rabble. It is the Jew that they despise in him. It is the pretensions of Judaism to the empire of the world that they cover with ridicule. These Gentiles had not the remotest idea that it was by the hatred of the Jews that he was condemned to the Cross, that it was his unavoidable conflict with the Jewish dream of universal empire that had plunged him into this abyss of shame. What a contrast between the clear, calm outlook of Jesus, comprehending within its sphere the future of the world's history, and the stupid blindness of these tools of power, bent only upon the momentary gratification of their barbarian humor.

Those moments of derision and mockery were doubtless among the most torturing that Jesus had in those last hours to endure. No complaint fell from his lips. He might have spoken, groaned, entreated, implored the soldiers to have pity on him. He might have appealed to their feelings of honor and humanity. Does there not beat in the rudest breast a human heart? But he opened not his mouth. This imperturbable silence indicates no sinking of the heart under the overwhelming sorrows poured upon his head. He had indeed trembled and shuddered in

Gethsemane. But now he is perfect master of his agony. It was a proof only of his holy, childlike submission to the will of his Heavenly Father. He suffered for the work of his life in accordance with the counsels of God and in sacred love of his country and mankind. No man understood him at this moment. His royal mind was veiled in suffering and contumely. But not on this account was he any the less conscious of his eternal worth. Ever clearer and clearer was presented before his vision the purpose of his death: to abolish the dead and deadly Letter, for the sake of which his death was decreed as a reconciliation of Divine righteousness, to teach the world that it can be reconciled to the righteousness of God only through the sacrifice of Love.

His executioners dragged him, covered with ridicule and contempt, to a place of execution upon a hill outside the city.[1] The comparatively long distance which he had to go increased his sufferings. According to the fourth Gospel, he had to carry his cross himself.[2] The statement of the older Gospels is however more probable, that, although against the common practice, Simon of Cyrene, a countryman accidentally passing by, was forced to carry it.[3] The probably delicate organization of Jesus, the extreme mental distress which he had undergone, the exhausting trials and cruel usage he had suffered, and all the savage uproar around him, — all rendered it impossible for him to drag along the burden of the cross.

2. That Jesus, on the way to the place of execu-

[1] Mark xv. 21; Matt. xxvii. 32; Luke xxiii. 33; John xix. 17.
[2] John xix. 17.
[3] Mark xv. 21; Matt. xxvii. 32; Luke xxiii. 26.

tion, broke the silence which he had preserved till then, Luke alone informs us, following in this particular a special and authentic tradition. To his judges, after he had once declared himself the Messiah and his condemnation had followed in consequence, he had nothing more to say. No murmur of pain, no outcry of indignation was allowed to betray his inmost emotions. It was his part to bear patiently the utmost severity of legal violence, the consequence, heavily as it might fall upon him, of the work of his life: the deliverance of the human soul and of all nations from the yoke of the letter and the chains of sin. But those lips that had been closed hours long were opened again when, on the way to the place of execution he saw many who were accompanying him, full of sympathy, many women especially, in tears and uttering exclamations of woe.[1] Touched at the sight Jesus was moved to speak a doubly monitory word to these women. He called to them and bade them not weep for him. He was not to be commiserated. He was to die in the bloom of life indeed but in the faithful performance of the work assigned him. His death was the necessary consequence of his great work. His apparent destruction was in reality his indefeasible victory. He could have been an object of pity only in case he had not completed his work by such a death,—had he, from fear of the horrors of death, preferred a broken life to death. Rather were they to weep for themselves and for their children. The overwhelming flood of his own agonies could not make him forgetful of the woes impending over the city of Jerusalem. He well knew that the doom of the city was sealed. And how much more to be pitied was

[1] Luke xxiii. 27.

the fate of Jerusalem and her population than his sufferings which were but for a moment! He compares himself to the green tree.[1] His is fresh, sound, imperishable life; and the blood flowing from his cross will soon be a refreshing stream of living water for the world. But Jerusalem with its hierarchy and with its deluded people chained to their fate, is — a dry tree. Israel is a trunk, stripped of its foliage, bearing fruit no more. From the desolation and ruins of the city of Zion, from the rivers of blood which its stones and walls were to drink up, from the woes of all kinds that were to befall its inhabitants and especially the most helpless, women and children, there would spring no fountain of life for the world. A terrible doom, in every way deserved, would fall upon the city of the Temple, upon its watchmen and shepherds, with the curse of centuries of wrong, of hypocrisy, and selfishness. When Jerusalem should fall, it would not be by the death of the righteous that the old worn-out Letter would be judged, but after long forbearance the unrighteous would be visited by the eternal justice of God.

With such words did Jesus break his long, deep silence, not to lament his own terrible fate, but to deplore the sufferings of others, the frightful calamities that were to plunge his unbelieving and obdurate countrymen and the city upon whose soil the place of his execution was now prepared, into the depths of despair. It was words of holy love, of pity gushing from the heart of this love, that he spoke. He had always regarded little children with tender interest. Their loving eyes had greeted him when he took them to his bosom and promised them they

[1] Luke xxiii. 31.

should have part in the kingdom of God. To them as to a better generation, he had looked for a better future. But now he pronounced that womb happy which had never borne a child, and happy the breast that had never given nourishment. When a nation no longer has strength to extricate itself from dead traditions, when it contemns the spirit of reform, when it repels the hand that offers it life, freedom, salvation, when it murders its prophets and rends in pieces its deliverers, then it has no longer any future, and no generation that may rise in it can inspire any hope. In such a case, a grave is all that can be desired for it, and the despair is justified that calls upon the mountains, "Fall on us!" and upon the hills, "Cover us!"[1]

3. Jesus, upon reaching the place of execution, was immediately nailed to the cross. According to custom there was offered him an intoxicating drink,[2] by which the torture of crucifixion was, in some degree, mitigated. Tradition went early astray, even in the first Gospel, in representing Jesus as refusing to take the "wine" mixed with gall because of its nauseous character.[3] The Evangelist was led into this error by a passage in the Psalms which seemed to him typical of the last hours of Jesus.[4] This drink was offered him not as an additional torture but to alleviate his sufferings, and Jesus refused it, not to endure one pang less, but in order to meet the last moment with unclouded consciousness. To die in a stupor, purposely caused, would have ill suited the sanctity of his character and the dignity of his Messianic office. To hang naked upon the cross — his clothes the soldiers,

[1] Luke xxiii. 30. [2] According to Mark (xv. 23) wine of myrrh.
[3] Matt. xxvii. 34. [4] Ps. lxix. 22.

according to custom, divided among themselves — with two malefactors crucified in like manner with him, was surely an aggravation of this hour of torture, a barbarous laceration of his sensibility, and a savage degradation of the sacredness of his person to the level of a common criminal; at the same time it showed also how little in earnest Pilate was in his wish to treat Jesus with merciful consideration.

But it was through this extreme humiliation, through these severe tortures, that the character of Jesus was shown in its unparalleled purity and greatness. He maintained perfectly his humility, his love, his tenderness, his fortitude, the Godlike nobleness of a soul made perfect in suffering. Silent before his judges, now he spoke. Few but golden are the words that he uttered, and that come down to us stamped with the seal of authenticity.

His voice was first heard in a prayer for his murderers: "Father! forgive them! they know not what they are doing,"[1] — fit words from the heart of the Crucified, overflowing with an unspeakable fulness of love, patience, submission, and goodwill towards men. Under the acute torture, caused in crucifixion by the raising of the cross, covered with all the indignities that could be heaped upon the vilest criminal, forsaken and disowned without thought or feeling by friends and disciples, there comes no groan from his lips, no cry, no bitter or despairing word, but a prayer for the forgiveness of his murderers. These men, he was persuaded, were under a delusion. They were the tools of religious and political fanaticism. The members of the High Council, who voted for his death, doubtless believed that by his execution they were

[1] Luke xxiii. 34.

doing God an acceptable service. Their God was a God of the strict letter, who had made a covenant with the Israelites,[1] which threatened with its curse every one who did not obey all the words of the Law.[2] There never once glimmered in their minds the remotest suspicion that the law of God would be anything more than a dead formula, and the promise of the Old Testament an empty letter, had they not delivered Jesus up to a cruel and shameful death. With all the learning of the schools, they were wrapt in blind ignorance. Their ignorance certainly was not without blame, for Jesus had endeavored with great power and earnestness to bring them to better knowledge. But their guilt was pardonable in so far as it was the mighty and magical influence of an authority consecrated by centuries of custom that led them astray. And when Jesus now implored his Heavenly Father to show mercy to these murderers, the prayer was an outburst of the pitying love of which he was the herald and the representative, and a confirmation of his saying that he sought to be the Saviour not of the well but of the sick.

Religious fanaticism and political hatred continued to persecute him even on the cross. A tablet, as was the custom, was put over his head, upon which was inscribed his alleged crime. The words, "The Jews' King,"[3] were a severe satire upon the hierarchy, the Jewish national party, and their feeble attempts at the empire of the world. Thus it would seem that the Roman authorities did not consider it beneath their dignity to indulge a mocking spirit even in an inscription

[1] Deut. xxix. 14. [2] Deut. xxvii. 26.

[3] Mark (xv. 26) has the original inscription. Luke xxiii. 38; Matt. xxvii. 37; John xix. 19.

on the cross. But the Jews themselves, treated as they were by Pilate with contempt, indulged the same spirit also under the cross. The affair of the purification of the temple was still fresh in the remembrance of the crowd gathered round the cross, and the saying of Jesus was still in their minds, that he would destroy the temple and in three days build a new temple.[1] When this saying was uttered, many exulted in words so full of hope and in the bold deed by which they were accompanied. Now, they looked upon Jesus as a vain boaster. So much had been told of his miracles, why did he not now work a miracle for his own deliverance? He had healed so many people, why did he not now save himself? Now, some cried out, he may work a real miracle, come down from the cross and deliver himself from his torments.[2] What miserable proof did they give of their moral and religious ignorance when they declared that, if they saw him by supernatural aid come down from the cross, they would believe in him![3] Their religion rested on the five senses. The invisible power of the spirit in which Jesus taught and labored and founded his kingdom had no existence to them. Only what they could see with their own eyes and clutch with their own hands had any weight with them as authority for their faith. They wanted what Jesus did not want, — the religion of miracles. The religion of truth and freedom which he desired they cared not for.

The criminals crucified with him, also, joined in the jeers of the Jewish rabble,[4] moved thereto partly perhaps by a bitter feeling against him because he

[1] Mark xv. 29; Matt. xxvii. 40.
[2] Mark xv. 31; Matt. xxvii. 42; Luke xxiii. 35.
[3] Mark xv. 32.
[4] Mark xv. 32; Matt. xxvii. 44.

would not work a miracle to deliver them as well as himself, and partly to find favor with the crowd in their last hours, the poor comfort of savage natures. The later tradition throws over the dark scene a somewhat softening light by the statement that only one of the criminals joined in the mockery, while it puts into the mouth of the other a rebuke of his fellow-sufferer, together with an earnest acknowledgment of the innocent character of Jesus, and a prayer to be admitted into his kingdom.[1] The reply of Jesus, promising the penitent immediate admission to Paradise, the dwelling-place of the righteous until the final resurrection,[2] fully accords, it is true, with the tenderness and good-will which, according to the same Evangelist, Jesus had just manifested towards his murderers, and is entirely worthy of the character of Jesus. But the concordant statement of the first two Evangelists, that both the criminals reviled him, comes from the oldest and most authentic sources. To the later, i. e. the Gentile Christian tradition, the temptation was strong, on the other hand, to make manifest, even in immediate vicinity to the cross, the opposition between the believing and the unbelieving portion of mankind, and to represent one of the two thieves as the type of unbelieving obduracy, the other as the type of repentant conversion.

4. Jesus had refused the stupefying drink. With full consciousness, amidst increasing tortures, he confronted the last moment. After six hours of extreme suffering that moment came, earlier than usual in this manner of dying. The Saviour of the world was not to be spared the pang of the death struggle. There then broke from his crushed heart the first and only cry of anguish that Jesus uttered in these hours of

[1] Luke xxiii. 39. [2] Luke xxiii. 43.

horror. It burst forth in the words of the Old Testament sufferer, "My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me?"[1] They evidently sunk ineffaceably into the memory of the persons standing around the cross, and were, beyond all doubt, uttered by Jesus. If the later tradition omits them,[2] it was because they were thought to be inconsistent with the idea of Jesus afterwards formed. They express a feeling so purely human, that they were not reconcilable with the exaggerated notions of his divinity, which grew up at a later period. They have been variously misinterpreted. They certainly do not mean that Jesus, when he uttered them, really felt himself forsaken by God, that the consciousness of communion with his Heavenly Father was extinguished within him. It is a common experience for the dying in the last struggle to recall to their wandering memory words of comfort and inspiration. In this respect Jesus shared in our weakness. The horror of the death-agony, wrapping his soul in night, obscured for a moment his otherwise clear consciousness of God, and he could express the momentary feeling only in the words of the Psalmist, who was conscious of most intimate communion with God.[3] But his condition was so unutterably miserable, that it seemed to him as if God had forsaken him. Therefore his cry of distress is not, "O God, why have *I* forsaken thee?" but, "*My* God, why hast *Thou* forsaken me?" Such a sense of extreme loneliness certainly did so overpower the soul of Jesus in the last moment, that he expressed himself as if he felt that his Heavenly Father had hidden his face

[1] Mark xv. 34; Matt. xxvii. 46; Ps. xxii. 1.

[2] They are wanting in Luke xxiii. 44–46, and in the fourth Gospel.

[3] Psalm xxii. 11, 21.

from him and left him to the overpowering burden of his agony. It was, however, only as the shadow of a cloud passing over the sun, dimming for an instant the light of the Divine love. But thereupon came the blessed end of his sufferings, and he expired with a loud cry. A pitying hand had just before wet his parched lips with a cooling sponge, — an act of humanity in which scorn mingled its gall, which would be strange if the human heart did not so often surprise us with its riddles. The report of Luke changing the outcry into a dying prayer, is doubtless of a later origin.[1]

5. According to the first three Gospels,[2] there were neither acquaintances, relatives, nor apostles present as witnesses of the last moments of Jesus. There were certain women, friendly to him, from Galilee, whom the rumor of his final labors in Judea and Jerusalem had drawn to the capital, who witnessed the terrible tragedy from a distance. The mother of Jesus was among them. These women, in their deep and loving sympathy, found no rest at home. To be near and witness the scene of suffering, to behold him helplessly put to shame under their very eyes, their revered friend, who was always so forgetful of his own comfort, and to whom, on that account, they had been wont to minister,[3] was beyond their strength ; his mother was unable to bear the sight except at a distance.

According to the fourth Gospel, the mother of Jesus, a cousin, and some young female disciples, passed those terrible hours with him at the cross.[4] But it is as much against historical probability that the oldest tradition, coming from the very theatre of those last events,

[1] Luke xxiii. 46 ; see Ps. xxxi. 6.

[2] Mark xv. 40 ; Matt. xxvii. 56 ; Luke xxiii. 49.

[3] Mark xv. 41.

[4] John xix. 25.

should make no mention of the presence of the women near the cross, an historical fact so noteworthy and so fitted to stamp itself at once on the memory, as it is offensive to natural feeling to think of the mother of Jesus and the other women as being, during his execution, in close proximity to the cross dripping with blood. The statement of the fourth Gospel belongs to a later tradition, that took its origin at a time when the persons of whom it tells were no longer living. As, according to the fourth Gospel, the public life of Jesus commenced with a sharp repulse of his mother, who had not then been converted by him,[1] it was natural for the same Evangelist to represent Jesus as concluding his career with a tender word making provision for his mother.[2] Her steadfast clinging to the cross appears, however, an all-sufficient atonement for her early indifference to the Gospel.

There are yet two other utterances of Jesus on the Cross reported by the fourth Gospel, but they could hardly have proceeded from him. According to this Gospel he gave words to his intolerable thirst.[3] But the first two Gospels give us to understand that his cry to God awoke of itself the pity of the bystanders ;[4] and it is not probable that he uttered any want in that moment of increasing agony, as the fourth Gospel attributes the exclamation "I thirst" to the necessity there was for the fulfilment of a passage of the Old Testament.[5] The statement also that Jesus died ejaculating "It is finished," appears to belong to the group of traditions peculiar to the fourth Gospel, and is not confirmed by the older Evangelists.

[1] John ii. 4.
[2] John xix. 26.
[3] John xix. 28.
[4] Mark xv. 34; Matt. xxvii. 48.
[5] The passage is Ps. lxix. 22.

The oldest tradition reports only one thing said by Jesus on the cross, and that is the exclamation of utter loneliness under the black shadow of the last agony, that entirely credible utterance, which could not possibly have been invented, as it was irreconcilable with the ideas which very early began to prevail concerning the divinity of the person of Jesus, and was, on this account, passed over by the later tradition.

Three of the exclamations ascribed to Jesus on the cross were derived from the original document followed by Luke. Of these three, the first[1] appears to be the most authentic, the second[2] less certain, and the third[3] seems the least credible of all, and does not appear to be in keeping with the later tradition of the fourth Gospel. That Jesus, after the example of a devout personage of the Old Testament,[4] should have commended his departing spirit into the hands of his Heavenly Father, was offensive to the faith in the divinity of Christ, which was becoming more distinctly defined at the beginning of the second century. From the point of view of the fourth Gospel, moreover, the words of Jesus on the cross handed down by the first three Gospels appeared inappropriate. How could the "Logos," the voluntary personal self-revelation of the Father say of himself that he was forsaken of God? How could Jesus on the cross excuse his Jewish judges, and say that they had sinned against him in ignorance, when in the fourth Gospel they are represented as the malignant instruments of Satan? Whether a malefactor, without making any previous confession of faith in the divine Sonship of Jesus could become a member of the kingdom of God was at least

[1] Luke xxiii. 34.
[2] Luke xxiii. 43.
[3] Luke xxiii. 46.
[4] Ps. xxxi. 6.

doubtful in the view of the fourth Gospel: and the Logos, if equal with God, could not resign his spirit into the hands of the Father, being in and of himself perfectly one with the spirit of the Father. On the other hand, the fourth Gospel has reported three different utterances of the Crucified: the first, receiving his mother into full favor by a provision made for her welfare;[1] the second, testifying to the complete fulfilment of a prophecy of the Old Testament;[2] and finally, the third, putting the seal of a victorious consummation upon the whole work and sufferings of Jesus,[3] a human, a mediatorial, and a Divine word.

For the consecration of the moral Idea of the Crucified these seven utterances are not needed. Only one of them is wholly unquestionable. How much of the others was really his, may be open to doubt. His silence, the expression of childlike submission, of imperturbable trust in God, of lowly obedience to his Heavenly Father, will ever remain the most exalted revelation of his holy character. His cry of suffering in the death struggle is an utterance of the infinite depth of the distress which he bore. This agony he conquered. The pillar of the Cross became the throne of his triumph. Even though he spoke not the word, "It is finished," the moment of his death was the consummation of his great work.

[1] John xix. 26. [2] John xix. 28. [3] John xix. 30.

NOTE.

[That extreme physical torture wrung from Jesus the despairing cry, "My God! My God! why hast thou forsaken me?" there can be no question. As Dr. Schenkel remarks, such an expression of mortal weakness could not have been invented. But are not the other utterances, ascribed to Jesus on the cross, most if not all of them, as truly if not as strikingly marked by the impress of truth? The first words he is recorded to have spoken were: "Father! forgive them! they know not what they are doing," a prayer which loses its life, its pathetic power, when it is understood as a general prayer for all his enemies, the hierarchs with the rest. Surely it would argue in him great physical insensibility, if in the condition he then was, a state of excruciating bodily torture, he could have been occupied with such a general consideration. It would not have been natural. The living and divine beauty of this prayer is disclosed when we understand it as having burst from his lips, while they were nailing him to the cross, and as immediately referring to his brutal and ignorant executioners. He could not believe that it was in human beings to cause such agony as they were inflicting on him, if they knew what they were about. His prayer for them was not at all of the general character which our author supposes, but a sudden, passionate ejaculation, revealing a generosity of mind which the most barbarous injuries could not embitter, and which could cease only with his life.

So also with the final words on the cross: "It is finished." They lose the sound of reality by being understood in too general a sense. It comes naturally to us to think that it is impossible to ascribe too deep a significance to the last words of the dying. We catch at every syllable and fancy it to have a world of meaning. But considering the circumstances, is it not most likely that this last brief utterance referred to the cessation of the intense physical suffering which he had been so long enduring, rather than to the consummation of the great work of his life? The relieving lethargy of death was creeping over him. His sensibility to pain ceased, and the ejaculation "It is finished," was simply equivalent to, "It is over."

The brief words addressed by Jesus from the cross to his mother and John, our author regards as very doubtful. He thinks it impossible that she could have been near enough to her

son to hear them,—that her maternal affection must have shrunk from witnessing his agonies. Unquestionably it must have been agonizing to her to witness that awful sight. And it would have been no less agonizing to her to keep at a distance from him. May she not have thought within herself: "It kills me to see him suffer so, but I cannot lose a word that may fall from his lips,—perhaps he may speak to me." The women, friends of Jesus, stood looking on from a distance, but if there were one among them who stood nearer to the cross than the rest, it must have been his mother. Here again the words of Jesus to his mother and the beloved disciple lose the living truth of nature in our Common Version, which gives them in the form of complete sentences, "Woman, behold thy son," and to John, "Behold thy mother." But in the original it is: "Woman! look! thy son," and to John, "Look! thy mother," brief as possible, ejaculatory, broken, in the fullest accord with the physical condition in which he then was, a state of extreme torture, admitting only at the moment of such imperfect utterance. His mother was not very near the cross, but near enough to allow Jesus, by a strong effort mastering his agony, to gasp out these few words, leaving it to the keen sense of his mother and John to make out his meaning. Indeed, if I could suspect such an incident as this to be an invention, I should not know what limit to assign to the inventive power of the authors of the Gospels.

I cannot but wish that we might have some clearer insight into what is recorded to have passed between Jesus and one of the malefactors crucified with him. There is an indefinable pathos in the incident. Amidst the horror of the scene, when mercy seemed to have vanished from earth, the penitent and generous emotion of that poor criminal must have gone to the heart of Jesus like balm dropping down from heaven,—the only sign of human sympathy coming from one, suffering like him, but not like him innocent.

In his very able analysis of the first Gospel in the first note of his Appendix, Dr. Schenkel alludes to the startling circumstances attending the crucifixion, and mentioned in Matt. xxvii. 52, 53, as miraculous. He does not appear to imagine that they are susceptible of being viewed in any other way. He loses sight altogether of the extraordinary sensation which so wonderful a person as Jesus must have made, when he fails to perceive how perfectly in accord with nature and all human history it is, that

at the death of such a person under such circumstances of horror and agony, rumors should be rife of precisely such strange facts as Matthew makes mention of. All things were then seen by the excited imaginations of the sensitive under exaggerated aspects. Circumstances which upon ordinary occasions would have arrested no notice became fearful portents. The gloom of an overcast day grew into a preternatural darkness. A rent in the veil of the Temple, which may very possibly have existed before, was then observed for the first time, and ghosts, apparitions, were seen by "many." Who can resist the evidence which such things as these furnish, not merely to the fact of the Crucifixion of Jesus, but to the whole great history! With awe I read in them the sign manual of Nature — of God himself. — TRANS.]

CHAPTER XXIX.

THE GLORIFIED.

1. ALL the evangelical reports testify to the profound moral impression made by Jesus while hanging on the cross upon numbers of those present, and especially upon those who were of his Communion. Although of his disciples the men fled from the place, the strength of character shown by the women, in their sympathy with their Master in his last agonies, is all the more striking. And that they wished to pay the last honors to the Departed by embalming his corpse, according to the custom of the Jews, is an irresistible proof that his horrible death had not been able to shake their faith in the sanctity of his life, and the moral greatness of his person.[1] A member of the High Council even, Joseph of Arimathea, who had taken no part in the condemnation of Jesus,[2] had the

[1] Mark xvi. 1; Luke xxiii. 55. [2] Luke xxiii. 50.

courage to beg his body of the Procurator, that it might be decently buried.[1] Although he had not ventured before the condemnation of Jesus to avow himself openly as his disciple, yet the greatness of character shown by Jesus on the cross, had made such an impression upon him, that no concern for consequences could deter him from giving this proof of his reverence and love for the Crucified. Only in the way in which Jesus bore his sufferings and overcame the terrors of his death was the full greatness, until then hidden, of his spirit and his nature manifested. It was in the depths of his mortal agonies that he rose to the height of his glory.

The Apostles in particular could not be insensible to the great impression made by his Cross. To the paralyzing terror, by which they were prostrated at his arrest, condemnation, and execution, there succeeded a revival of their love and trust and hope. The women, however, were in advance. They visited the grave of Jesus at sunrise on the morning of the first day of the week. They found the stone rolled away, and the grave empty. In the place of the corpse of Jesus, they saw as they believed a celestial apparition. They fell into an ecstasy, the consequence of the great excitement which, with the sensibility characteristic of their sex, they had just undergone. But they did not venture at the first even to speak of the mysterious event. Jesus did not appear to the women in his own person. But it was an angel whom they reported to have told them that Jesus would personally appear to his disciples in Galilee.[2] The whole conduct

[1] Mark xv. 43; Matt. xxvii. 57; Luke xxiii. 50; John xix. 38.

[2] Mark gives us the simplest and most primitive account of the resurrection of Jesus (xvi. 1–18).

of the women, the visit to the grave at the early dawn, the apparition of the angels, — all furnish indubitable proof that the faith of some of his adherents in the indestructible life of Jesus was not shaken by the manner of his death, but had received new nourishment and strength. The oldest tradition has nothing to tell of the appearances of Jesus in Jerusalem. It says only that they found the grave empty. This it asserts.[1] The belief on the other hand that Jesus, having risen, would appear to the Apostles in Galilee, the earliest and largest theatre of his career, must have been very generally spread among his disciples in Jerusalem a few days after his death. A later tradition has amplified the account of what the angels said at the open grave.[2] A still later tradition has left it all out. Instead of the direction to meet Jesus in Galilee, the third Gospel has a reference to the communication, made by him to his disciples in Galilee before his final journey to Jerusalem, concerning his then impending death and resurrection.[3]

With the oldest report, amplified, of the appearance of angels to the women at the grave, the first Gospel gives place also to a report unknown to the oldest Evangelist, namely, that Jesus, on the first day of the week after the crucifixion, appeared to two of the women returning from the grave to Jerusalem. But even according to this report it is not Jerusalem but Galilee where the risen Jesus wishes to show himself to his disciples.[4] The appearance of the angels, like the appearance of Jesus, serves no purpose but to communicate to the disciples, through the women, a direction to meet their risen Master in Galilee. There,

[1] Mark xvi. 4.
[2] Matt. xxviii. 2.
[3] Luke xxiv. 6.
[4] Matt. xxviii. 9.

according to the first Evangelist, Jesus really met the Eleven upon a mountain, and took leave of them with the declaration that all power was his in heaven and upon earth. At the same time he gave them his last instructions. He commanded them to convert and baptize all nations, and promised them his powerful assistance till the end of the world.[1] According to the documents which the third Gospel followed,[2] not one angel but two angels appeared to a number of the women at the grave; but Jesus himself did not appear to them. The reports of the women, moreover, found no credit among the Apostles. Nevertheless, Jesus appeared, according to this Evangelist, not in the morning, but in the evening of the first day of the week after the crucifixion, to two unknown disciples on the way to Emmaus, in the neighborhood of Jerusalem. He walked and talked with them as an ordinary person, conversed with them especially about the Messianic promises of the Old Covenant, sat down with them at table, and vanished from their sight in the act of blessing and distributing the bread.[3]

In the mean while, Jesus had appeared also to Peter in Jerusalem,[4] and to the eleven disciples in the evening of the first day of the week after the crucifixion. According to the third Gospel, Jesus on this last occasion refuted the idea that he was a "spirit" by showing his hands and feet, (that had been nailed to the cross,) in order that they might be seen and touched, and he ate of a broiled fish and of an honeycomb, the object being to convince the assembled disciples of his bodily presence.[5] He availed himself also

[1] Matt. xxviii. 18.

[2] Luke xxiv. 10. The original Mark is here neither used nor worked up by Luke.

[3] Luke xxiv. 13–32. [4] Luke xxiv. 34. [5] Luke xxiv. 37–43.

of this occasion to prove to them from the Scriptures of the Old Covenant that in his sufferings, death, and resurrection, the promise of Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms was fulfilled. And what happened on the same evening in Jerusalem is reported by the first two Evangelists to have taken place upon a mountain in Galilee. He blessed his disciples and bade them farewell. But if, according to the older tradition preserved by the first Evangelist, Jesus promised his disciples on the Galilean mountain to be with them always till the end of the world, according to the later tradition of the third Evangelist, after giving his command to the disciples not to leave Jerusalem until they were endued with the power of the spirit from on high, he was carried up to heaven.[1]

2. The evangelical tradition in the fourth Gospel, in regard to the events following the crucifixion of Jesus, does not vary very materially from the older reports of the first three Gospels. It was not several women, but only Mary of Magdala, according to this Gospel, who visited the grave early in the morning of the first day.[2] Peter and John were convinced, upon the intelligence received from Mary, that the corpse was no longer in the grave.[3] But they found it very hard to satisfy themselves of his resurrection.[4] Then first Mary saw an angel, and in fact two angels,[5] in accordance with the third Gospel. The appearance of Jesus followed immediately the appearance of the angels, under wholly different circumstances, however, from

[1] Luke xxiv. 51; Acts i. 4–9. The book of Acts differs from the Evangelists in representing the appearances of Jesus after his resurrection to have been repeated during forty days. It follows a later document.

[2] John xx. 1.

[3] John xx. 6.

[4] John xx. 9; compare Luke xxiv. 12.

[5] John xx. 12.

those stated in the third Gospel. While, according to the third Gospel, Jesus suffered himself to be touched, and while he takes food, according to the fourth, on the other hand, Mary is not permitted to touch him, and is directed only to inform the disciples — "his brothers," he calls them — that he had not yet ascended, but was about to ascend, to his Heavenly Father.[1] And here, within the circle of this tradition, the history of Jesus is concluded. Jesus does not appear again to his disciples. He does not appoint them to meet him either upon a mountain in Galilee or in Jerusalem. He merely sends word to them through Mary (and only indeed, apparently, because she had distinguished herself above the others by her devotion and fidelity), that he still lived and was about to enter into full possession of the immortal life of heaven with his God and Father and their God and Father.

The account therefore of two other additional appearances of Jesus after his resurrection, related in the fourth Gospel, must have been derived from other sources, connected with those used by Luke, but taking a new shape in the hands of the fourth Evangelist. According to this account, Jesus, on the evening of that same first day of the week, appeared among his disciples, *the doors being closed*, — thus as a spirit without a material body, — and, after saluting them, showed them his hands and his side, to convince them, doubtless, of his corporeal presence.[2] Here also he took leave of them. What the first Gospel represents him as doing on the mountain in Galilee, he does also, according to the fourth Gospel, in Jerusalem. He gives his Apostles the same commission to convert

[1] John xx. 17. [2] John xx. 19.

mankind, and bestows on them his Holy Spirit and the power to remit sins. From the kindred account in the third Gospel, according to which they were to wait in Jerusalem, the fourth Gospel consequently varies; with the promise, however, contained in this Gospel of the approaching return of Jesus through the revelation of his Holy Spirit, this representation entirely agrees.[1] The narrative of another appearance of Jesus eight days later in the presence of Thomas, who was absent on the previous occasion, is evidently an addition from another source. This narrative tells us that Jesus again appeared among his disciples, *the doors being closed*, and offered his hands to be touched and his side to be felt[2] by Thomas, in order to convince him of his resurrection. In a closing addition it is declared that Jesus, after his resurrection, did many other "signs" in the presence of his disciples,[3] of which, however, in a still later addition to the Gospel, only one is mentioned.[4] The appearance of Jesus at the sea of Tiberias plainly betrays, in its details, the traces of a post-apostolic legend. The intercourse of Jesus with his disciples on this occasion is such as implies that he was still living an earthly life. As, at an early period, when upon the shores of the same sea, he called his first disciples,[5] so now, in taking his departure, he causes a miraculous draught of fishes.[6] Peter, who, by the denial of his Master, had shown himself unworthy the Apostolic office, Jesus receives again in the most solemn manner into the company of the Apostles, and finally Jesus corrects a legend respecting John that had gone abroad to the effect that this Apostle was not to live to see the return of Jesus.

[1] John xiv. 16. [2] John xx. 26. [3] John xx. 30.
[4] John xxi. 1. [5] Luke v. 1. [6] John xxi. 4.

Finally, an addition, in the second Gospel,[1] is evidently a later composition drawn from the older evangelical traditions; its origin is to be attributed to the fact that the Gospel appeared to end abruptly with the eighth verse.

3. The various traditions concerning the appearances of Jesus after his death may, on the whole, be distinguished with tolerable clearness in the following manner:

a. The oldest tradition, contained in the original Mark (*Urmarcus*), is confined to the statement that early in the morning of the first day of the week after the crucifixion, some women, friends of Jesus, visited his grave and found it empty. Upon this occasion an angel is said to have appeared to them and informed them that Jesus, in accordance with a previous understanding with his disciples,[2] would appear to them in Galilee. *Of an actual appearance of Jesus, the oldest source of tradition affords us no information.* The idea that the conclusion is missing is a mere unfounded conjecture.

b. In the first Gospel, the author of which made use of the original Gospel of Mark, we find a double manipulation of the oldest tradition, in conformity to which Jesus is represented to have appeared *first* to the women, upon the morning of the resurrection, in *Jerusalem*, and *secondly*, to have taken leave of his disciples upon the mountain in Galilee referred to by the angel. As to the second statement, it may possibly, in its essential points, be tortured out of the original Mark; it stands in contradiction with the first.

[1] Mark xvi. 9–20.

[2] For this understanding we are referred to Mark xiv. 28, the declaration of Jesus upon his last visit to Gethsemane.

c. As the elder narrative contains no precise specification of the particulars of the appearances of Jesus after his crucifixion, a later source of tradition, made use of by the third Evangelist, sought to satisfy the demand of the reflecting understanding. The appearances of Jesus were not merely promised by the angels, or only transiently made mention of by the women when they were charged with the commission of informing his disciples that they were to go to Galilee as in the first Gospel,[1] but these appearances were actually made to the disciples in Jerusalem, and indeed on the very day of the resurrection. The story is founded, beyond doubt, upon the idea that the physical organization of Jesus remained unchanged, and that even the functions of the lungs, of digestion, and of locomotion, had suffered no derangement from the death of the cross. Not as a glorified "spirit," but as a formal man, Jesus appeared, according to this tradition, in the midst of his justly amazed disciples. The account was, doubtless, meant to dissipate every doubt as to the corporeal reality of Jesus. But in truth our doubts are only the more strengthened by the fact that Jesus nevertheless passes without any difficulty through shut doors, suddenly vanishes like a disembodied spirit from the eyes of his disciples, and is carried up to heaven. The demand of the reflecting understanding is met by this tradition, it is true, but not by any means even moderately satisfied. The aim was to dissipate doubt, but it is of necessity strengthened by the contradictions involved in these accounts.

d. There is still less satisfaction in the statements

[1] The statement in Matt. xxviii. 9, that the women held Jesus by the feet, is intended, not to prove that he was really flesh and blood, but to express the reverential feelings of the women.

of the fourth Gospel. At one time, Jesus is represented as a "spirit," — Mary, for example, must not touch him. At another time, he bears himself like a living man. Thomas lays his fingers in the wounds in his hands and side. Now he comes among his assembled disciples through closed doors, and now, upon another occasion, he requires his disciples to have faith that the organs of his body are really flesh and bone.

e. The tradition in the last supplement to the fourth Gospel departs the farthest from the oldest reports. Here Jesus holds intercourse with his disciples entirely as if he were still living among them.[1]

According to all the evangelical accounts, the appearances of Jesus after his resurrection have substantially one and the same purpose, to give to the great work of the Lord a fitting termination, and to announce his last will to the band of disciples. Therefore, in the primitive Mark the angel directs them to go to Galilee for a final interview with Jesus. Therefore, in the third Gospel he gives them his last blessing, and promises them the Holy Spirit. For the same reason, in the fourth Gospel, he sends them forth, and gives them the Holy Spirit. All that he does is in keeping both with his personal dignity and his official position. So far, the tradition rests upon historical grounds. The case is different with the final addition to the fourth Gospel. This has throughout inferior purposes, partly to prove the miraculous and prophetic gifts of the risen Master, partly to save the memory of Peter, and partly to account for the death of John before the return of Jesus. So little does Jesus appear here in really new glory that the incidents nar-

[1] John xxi. 4 *et seq.*

rated might be transferred back without any difficulty into the time of his early career in Galilee.

4. The accounts of the resurrection no doubt form a necessary conclusion to the evangelical history. They belong to a complete historical portrait of Jesus. *It is an indisputable fact that in the early morning of the first day of the week following the crucifixion the grave of Jesus was found empty.* The place where the grave was was known to hundreds. How could the belief that the grave was found empty have arisen and continued uncontradicted, had not the fact been really so? The belief in the resurrection of Jesus among the disciples in Jerusalem was certainly founded at the first upon this fact of the empty grave. The company of disciples in Jerusalem pronounced it a miracle of divine power, and believed that it was wrought by means of angels. Thus arose the oldest tradition of the apparition of angels, and it rested upon the declarations of those highly excited women. *It is a second fact that the disciples and other members of the Apostolic Communion were convinced that Jesus was seen after his crucifixion.* Appearances of the Crucified were reported with such unanimity on the whole, although varying in particulars, that the faith of those who first reported them is beyond question, and certain it is that these accounts contributed much to strengthen the disciples and keep them together, bowed down and crushed as they were in consequence of the crucifixion of Jesus. We have a classic witness to the fact that Christ appeared several times among his disciples in the Apostle Paul,[1] who in proof thereof appeals to *five hundred* of the brothers, still living in his time, to whom Christ appeared.[2]

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 4.

[2] 1 Cor. xv. 6.

There is a third fact: the appearances of Jesus after his death, related in the Gospels, had, substantially, no other character than that which marked the appearance of Christ to the Apostle Paul upon his journey to Damascus.[1] Paul mentions the appearance of Christ to himself among the other appearances related in the Gospels as in every respect of a like description. Thence we may conclude that the accounts in the Gospels which represent the risen Master as having a material body cannot be well grounded. From the account in the book of Acts, it does not appear that Jesus wrought any effect upon the Apostle through the organs of a material body.[2] It was an appearance of light attended by a voice, which, according to this representation, was perceived by Paul. He himself describes his vision of Christ as emphatically an inward revelation of Christ. It pleased God to reveal his Son *in* him.[3] Consequently, the Risen Christ is the transfigured and glorified Christ, the Lord, who is the Spirit,[4] as the fourth Gospel represents him, essentially the living Spirit leading his Communion into all truth, and not until he was glorified in death, penetrating the body of his disciples more and more effectively with his life.

Thus Jesus himself — according to the evangelical tradition — solemnly recognized in his resurrection a victory of the eternal Spirit over the Jewish letter and the sensual illusions of Heathenism. As the Risen One, he is exalted above earthly powers and the limitations of sense. When he enters the circle of his disciples through closed doors, it is a symbol that, thenceforth, he reveals himself to his disciples invisibly,

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 8.
[2] Acts ix. 3; xxii. 6; xxvi. 13.
[3] Gal. i. 16.
[4] 2 Cor. iii. 17.

and that he is to be discerned with the inner eye of the spirit. It was through these appearances of Christ that the disciples arrived, in a way unknown before, at a clear, untroubled consciousness of the character of their Master as of a spiritual and eternal presence, and, on this account, essentially divine. They now first discerned his kingdom as a kingdom of the spirit and of the truth. Now first was it revealed to them that his Messianic kingship consisted in making all nations his disciples, and in illuminating all mankind with the light of his Gospel.[1] Now first they understood his office of peace in the true light of the pre-ordained salvation of all nations. They saw that the promises of the Old Covenant could find their real fulfilment, — not in the glitter of an earthly crown, — but only in the pure fire of love, transfigured in the glow of suffering and through the pain of self-sacrifice. Now first were they confirmed in the joyful confidence that the Spirit giveth life, and they ceased to have any doubt that the Letter kills.

It is common to regard the physical re-animation of the Crucified as the essential point in the accounts of the Resurrection, and to build faith in the power of the Gospel to overcome the world upon this external fact. That Jesus came forth from the grave on the third day after his crucifixion with the very same body that hung upon the cross, that his body could be felt by the hands of his disciples, that his bodily functions went on as before, appears to many to have been the indispensable condition of the success of Christianity. Only thus, it is thought, can we explain the sudden revival of the faith of the disciples, utterly cast down as they were by preceding events. But it is forgotten

[1] Matt. xxviii. 19.

that the women showed courage and devotion even before the resurrection; that on the evening of the first day of the week, before any appearance of Christ had taken place, the Apostles, according to the later tradition, were assembled[1] in Jerusalem, and therefore neither scattered nor wholly disheartened; that — still according to the Gospel accounts — it was the miraculous communication of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost that first kindled in the Apostolic body the fire of an unquenchable faith and the glow of self-sacrificing love. To a faith that rests upon the external fact of a bodily resurrection of Jesus, the Apostle Paul has denied any worth, for he says, "Though we have known Christ after the *flesh*, yet now henceforth know we him no more *so*. If any man be *in* Christ, there is a new creation; old things are passed away, all things become new."[2] Jesus Christ, the risen, the glorified, the exalted, is as such the Christ living in his Communion, and he will be with it, therefore, to the end of the world.[3] If, after his crucifixion, he returned among men the same as formerly, in a material body, and if this re-animation in the body were the most effectual expression of victory gained by him over sin, death, and condemnation, why should he not, in this case, have shown himself to the Jewish judges and to the Roman Procurator? Why did he not appear in the streets of Jerusalem to the people who were so grossly deceived in regard to him? Why did he not, by his bare appearance, revive anew the courage of his affrighted adherents everywhere, and at the same time and in the same way annihilate his malignant foes? Nothing of this kind happened. The risen Saviour appeared only in the little circle of the Apostles and

[1] Luke xxiv. 33. [2] 2 Cor. xvi. 17. [3] Matt. xxviii. 20.

of his disciples, exclusively to those who believed in him already before his death, and not to those who had rejected and killed him. His appearances were so many glorified illustrations of his Idea in the hearts of those who believed in him, and in whom, until then, that Idea had been overcast and dim. In these appearances, he showed himself as the eternally Living, building his kingdom on earth by his word and his Spirit, delivering Jews and Gentiles from the yoke of the Letter, fulfilling the Law by the spirit of evangelical truth and freedom, forever taking away the curse of the Letter from the nations, and kindling, from age to age, in an ever brighter flame, the life of love in mankind.

5. It creates a feeling of sadness to observe how many are still seeking to rest the truth of Christianity upon external facts, which can never be a really sound basis for it. This is especially the case with the fact of the resurrection, the only indisputably sufficient proof of which is the proof of the spirit and of power. Jesus Christ has truly risen, for he lives in his Communion, not in flesh and blood, not perceptible to the senses, not to the earth-blinded eye, but clearly seen by the children of the spirit, always present to the eye of faith, — daily, hourly, visible to this in the crises of the world's history, and in the still private sphere of human life, proving himself the Saviour of mankind. Those, who do not believe in the real presence of the living Christ in history and in life, must, in order not to doubt altogether his existence in history, endeavor to produce authentic proof that, eighteen centuries ago and upwards, he lived on earth in the body sometime after his death, and was carried up in the body to heaven.

The Christian Communion needs now, more than

ever, a living Christ, who, in death, conquered death, and became the creator, for time and for eternity, of imperishable life for mankind collectively and individually. The attempt has been renewed at the present period to bring the Christian Communion under the yoke of the Letter and into subjection to obsolete traditions. Hierarchs of the stamp of Caiaphas and statesmen of the character of Pilate are still ever nailing Christ to the pillar of the Cross. In their hands Christianity is a shell and not a living germ; the Church, instead of being a living Communion, is a corporation of priests established for the subjugation not for the deliverance of the nations, a scourge of Divine wrath, not a gift of Divine grace. The kingdom of God in its truth, freedom, and spirituality is, in their eyes, a phantasy, the Saviour a dogmatic idea, faith a formula of the catechism to keep children, large and small, in order.

The living Christ, although still hidden from Pharisees and Herodians, is, nevertheless, with ever-growing clearness and power, revealed to babes. He lives in his Communion. He takes up his abode now, as of old in Galilee, in the huts of the people. The poor, the despised, they who are persecuted for righteousness' sake, children, are his favorites. Here is his home. The Communion of his friends is his Temple. The living Christ is the spirit of his Communion. It is incumbent upon the Christian Communion, as its destination, its duty and its glory, to restore again to its peculiar life and calling, in the truth and freedom of the Gospel, the true consciousness, and therewith to serve the nations. In this it will all the sooner succeed, the sooner it attains to a correct knowledge and living appreciation of the person of Jesus Christ.

For he must be known, — the living, and on this account the historical Christ, who not only taught in the body centuries ago in Galilee and suffered in Jerusalem, but still lives on in all those in whom his word has become spirit and life, through freedom of thought and the truth of faith and love. To the liberty of the Gospel all nations are called, and the truth of the Gospel will make them free.

NOTE.

[In what I have to say upon the subject of this final chapter, the reappearance of Jesus alive on the morning of the third day after his crucifixion, I premise that I am not conscious of being biassed in my views of this extraordinary fact by any dogmatic interest in it whatever. I am free to confess, that I can see no purpose which it served beyond that which Dr. Schenkel states when he remarks, that the belief entertained by the Apostles and first disciples in the fact, had a powerful influence in reanimating their faith and hopes. It tended, as he says, "to strengthen the disciples and keep them together, bowed down and crushed as they were in consequence of the crucifixion of Jesus" (p. 313). But what further significance the fact itself has, admitting it to be a fact, does not yet clearly appear. I do not rest the truth of Christianity, nor any of its great ideas, upon the actual reappearance of Christ alive after his crucifixion.

The difficulties that encumber such accounts as have come down to us of the resurrection of Jesus are beyond all question many and obvious. Our author has not failed to state them faithfully. He does not for a moment entertain any idea of fraud in the composition of these narratives, for the simple reason that, whatever inconsistencies, contradictions, and errors they contain, the suspicion that any fraudulent design had part in producing them is utterly inadmissible. If, in regard to the essential fact, the reappearance of Jesus alive, these accounts are not true, then the only possible supposition is, that their authors were not deceivers but mistaken, the victims of an illusion. Such is mani-

festly the conclusion of Dr. Schenkel. The only certain facts that he can gather from these conflicting stories are, that the grave of Jesus was found empty on the morning of the first day of the week after the crucifixion, and that it was the universal belief of the first disciples, that Jesus reappeared alive after his death on the cross. Beyond these points he finds himself bound to regard the stories of the reappearance of Jesus as illusions, fables, legends. But that these two facts are all the truth that can be extracted from the stories of the Resurrection, cannot be admitted, as the investigation is by no means complete. Every historical fable, legend, or fiction, which cannot be accounted for on the supposition of a fraudulent origin, has a cause, a genesis of its own, and until that is satisfactorily traced, there still remains matter of inquiry. It is easy enough to pronounce any given historical relation a fiction. But we cannot stop there. The question comes up and is to be answered: How came this fiction ever to have been believed to be true? And this question becomes especially urgent and interesting when the story is in any good degree circumstantial. Illusions are vague and loose, but what if the account of them is minute, particular? Are we not curious in such a case to discover what caused such distinct and particular impressions of reality?

Now the four different accounts of the first reappearance of Jesus are of this minute character, and one is curious to know how the details of these stories are to be accounted for, what it was that produced so many various impressions upon the minds of their authors as are herein related. I confine myself here to the accounts of the first appearance of Jesus after his crucifixion. In regard to the accounts of his other and subsequent appearances, I can come to no equally satisfactory conclusions. But the four different stories of the first appearance of Jesus alive after death are very peculiar, and a careful sifting of them produces certain most remarkable results.

Before entering upon a careful examination of them, I must observe that I can find no ground for the representation which our author gives of the state of mind among the disciples of Jesus after his crucifixion. We are told, in the second paragraph of the foregoing chapter, of a revival of "love, trust and hope" among the friends of Jesus; and the visit of the women to the grave is referred to as an indication of such a revival. But the women went to the grave upon a funereal errand, to embalm the remains

of Jesus. And the other disciples "mourned and wept." (Mark xvi. 10.) They were all overwhelmed by the dread calamity which had scattered their splendid visions, blasted the hopes, which they had so fondly cherished of the Messiah's glorious reign. I would further remark, that there is one fact stated in the first Gospel to which Dr. Schenkel makes no allusion,* the fact of a guard stationed at the grave, which I see no reason for discrediting, a fact which evidently was not known to the disciples until after the extraordinary occurrences of that memorable morning. It is not to be supposed that the women would have gone to the grave with the expectation of accomplishing the errand upon which they went, had they known that there were Roman soldiers stationed there. Had the disciples known of the guard, and of the purpose for which the guard was placed at the grave, it might possibly have led them to revolve in their minds the promises of Jesus that he would rise again. But in their ignorance of this circumstance there was nothing to recall to their remembrance the assurances of their Master that he would return to life. At the time those assurances were uttered, the disciples were so pre-occupied with those brilliant Messianic hopes, which would not allow them to entertain the thought of his dying, that they could not take in the import of his promises. And now he was dead, and why, as I have already had occasion to observe, should they recall anything in particular that he had said, when

* In the first note of his Appendix, however, reference is made to the "almost more than miraculous" incidents mentioned by Matthew in relation to the guard at the tomb of Jesus. I can see no reason for characterizing them thus. What is there in the account given of a guard at the tomb to tax our faith? We read in the Gospels that Jesus again and again predicted his resurrection. This prediction the disciples, *believing him to be the Messiah*, were utterly at a loss to comprehend. They questioned among themselves "what the rising from the dead should mean" (Mark ix. 10). But, be it observed, the Priests, having no such faith in his Messiahship, had no difficulty in understanding him. They caught at the meaning of his words in their obvious sense, and, having no faith in him or his disciples, feared that some fraud was intended, and therefore procured a guard to watch the grave. And, certainly, as there is nothing miraculous in this fact, neither is there anything strange in the report which the guard made of what occurred at the place. It bears the manifest marks of the greatest terror.

his death, as it seemed to them, falsified every thought and hope which his life had encouraged and authorized them to entertain? Let us now see what may be fairly gathered from the four narratives of the first reappearance of Jesus. Mark the incidents of that morning in the order in which they occurred.

First, there is a rumor that evidently comes from the soldiers stationed as a guard at the grave. They come running into the city, saying in great affright that there had been an earthquake at the grave, and that a figure *all in white* had appeared and rolled away the stone from the entrance of the grave and seated himself upon the stone. The story is in one respect very natural. It bears the marks of the exaggerating effect of terror. But right upon this rumor comes another. Mary rushes in pale and breathless, and tells Peter and John that she and some other women had gone to the tomb, carrying spices with them, in which according to custom they proposed to wrap the body; that as they approached the spot, querying among themselves how they should get access to the grave, doubting their own ability to remove the stone, they discovered to their astonishment that the stone was actually moved out of place. Instantly impressed with the idea that the body had been removed, without waiting to verify the impression, having no doubt of its truth, she came to tell Peter and John, and to beg them to go back to the grave with her, which they do in the greatest haste. Hardly have they gone, when the other women who had gone with Mary to the place, make their appearance in a state of still greater excitement. They say that, after Mary left them, they stood for a moment at the entrance of the grave wondering what the removal of the stone could mean, and then went into the grave, and to their amazement and affright found there "a *young man* sitting on the right side in a *long white* garment." Some of the women said there were "two men standing" close to them "in *shining* garments." They reported that they were so terrified that they prostrated themselves on the ground. One of these persons spoke to them, told them he knew who they were and what they came there for, but that what they sought was not there; and he bade them see for themselves that the grave was empty. He told them moreover that Jesus had risen, and that they must go tell the disciples and Peter, and that Jesus would meet them in Galilee. Such is the report of the women, who were in a condition of the greatest alarm and wonder. But in a little while in

come Peter and John, and they verify the report of the grave's being empty. They went into it, they say, and found that the body was gone, although, strange to say, the grave-clothes were still there, and exhibiting no marks of violence. They saw no one there. Hardly is Peter and John's story told, when Mary, whom they had left at the grave, rushes in, in a state of unutterable delight and wonder, and she says, that, after Peter and John left the place, she was standing there by the grave weeping, and she stooped down, and just as she was looking into it she was startled by a voice, which came, she did not exactly know at the moment whence, inquiring why she was weeping. She answered it however by stating that it was because some one had taken away the body of her Master, and she did not know where it was. But before she could say all this, she became aware of some one approaching behind her. She turned, she said, and glanced at the person approaching, and supposed it must be the man who had care of the garden in which the grave was. He asked her why she wept and whom she wanted, and, under the impression that he must have heard her just tell the cause of her grief, she begged him, if he had laid the body elsewhere, to tell her where it was, and she would take it away. To this, the only answer of the supposed gardener was her own name, "Mary," uttered in a voice that thrilled her whole soul. It sounded like the voice of Jesus himself! She gazed into his face, recognized him and fell breathless in an ecstasy of rapture, and clasped his knees with such strength of emotion as if she would assure herself that it was real flesh and blood, and as if she would never let him go. Whereupon he told her not to stop to embrace him then, as he had not yet ascended to his Father: she would have other opportunities of seeing him. And he bade her go and tell his disciples that he was going to his Father and theirs.

I state Mary's account thus, because it is plain that she could not have thought at the moment when she stooped down and looked into the grave that she saw angels and that it was they who addressed to her the first question: "Why weepest thou?" Had she so thought, it is impossible that her attention could have been diverted from them, as it was, immediately. And it is plain also why she was led to tell the story as it stands in the fourth Gospel. When she returned to the city and talked with the other women, and heard their story, and learned that they had seen what they believed to be angels, she instantly concluded that

the white objects she had seen in the grave were the very same angels that the women had seen, and that that first question, which at the moment startled her (and which really came from the person behind her), was put to her by those angels. I suppose also that, as, in telling her story, she appealed to that act of clasping his knees, or "holding him by his feet" to prove that she had the evidence of the sense of touch that it was real flesh and blood and not an apparition which she saw, she herself, or those who heard her account, undesignedly varied the phraseology of what the supposed gardener said to her, and he is represented to have told her not to *touch* him, when he may have used words that had no such obscurity as the address now has as it stands in the narrative.

The first Gospel states, that all the women met Jesus as they were returning from the grave, and that they "held him by his feet." Is it not evident that this is an error? And is it not evident also how it arose? As all the women went to the grave together, and as, shortly after the women came back, declaring that they had seen an angel or angels, who told them that Jesus had risen, Mary came declaring that she had seen Jesus himself, the two stories naturally enough got mixed, and the impression was received by some, that *all* the women had seen Jesus. As it was Mary alone who saw him, it was Mary alone who "held him by his feet." The mention of this circumstance, though erroneously ascribed to the women, — does it not intimate that this fact was referred to as evidence of the sense of *touch* that it was a real person who had been seen, and no illusion of the eye?

Although the fourth Gospel makes no mention of any women but Mary at the grave, it is evident from this Gospel even that she did not go to the place alone, for it reports her as saying to Peter and John, when she ran back to them upon finding the stone removed, "They have taken away the Lord, and *we* know not where they have laid him."

Is it not evident also, that, although the third Gospel mentions two persons seen by the women, there was in truth but one? The first and second Gospels mention only one, and it is noteworthy, that this supposed angel speaks in the first person singular, — "Lo! *I* have told you," not, "*We* have told you."

It cannot fail to be observed that the most striking thing descriptive of the person seen by the women at the grave and by the guard is his *white* garments. As the white grave-clothes were found by Peter and John not lying together, but in two separate

places, is it not natural that the excited imagination of some or of all of the women, when they suddenly found themselves addressed by a person in white, should have mistaken the other white appearance, imperfectly seen in the dimness of the grave, for another figure in white? And as Peter and John were surprised at finding the white grave-clothes when the body was gone, is it not natural that Mary should be so much startled at the white things, which she caught sight of when she stooped down and looked into the grave, as to have concluded afterwards, when she was told by the other women that they had seen two angels in white in the grave, that those white objects must have been those very angels?

Not to leave any point unexplained, I suggest that "the great earthquake" reported by the guard, was simply the jarring of the ground, caused by the motion of the stone when it was rolled away, and exaggerated by the panic-struck soldiers into an earthquake.

Now just as certain as Dr. Schenkel admits it to be, that on the morning of the first day of the week after the crucifixion the body of Jesus had disappeared and the grave was found open and empty, so certain is it that there was some living unknown person there, who was mistaken by the guard and by the women for a supernatural apparition. We may pause and rest in this conclusion and go no further, saying that we cannot tell who this stranger was; but that a living person was actually there we are compelled to admit. Even if we accept our author's account of the second Gospel, which recommends itself to him as the most primitive of our Christian Records, partly because it contains no accounts of the reappearance of Jesus after his crucifixion, (see Appendix, Ill. 1 p. 25,) we must, even following only the second Gospel, admit that there was a living person at the grave who spoke to the women. For my own part, I am free to confess that it is out of my power to resist the still further conclusion that this unknown person was no other than Jesus himself alive. I feel all the difficulties by which this conclusion is beset. The questions which it raises I cannot answer. Nevertheless, the fact that it was Jesus who was there and who spoke to the women, is established by evidence, which to my mind is absolutely irresistible. It is evidence which there was no human design to furnish. It was Jesus himself, who, waking mysteriously from the mysterious sleep, pushed away the stone from the mouth of the grave, and, clad in the long white grave clothes, came forth to the terror

of the guard, who fled at the startling apparition. Hardly had the guard left the spot when Jesus, hearing the voices of the women approaching, perhaps in the dimness of the morning twilight descrying them in the distance, retired into the grave, not prepared to make himself then known. When the women entered the grave, he spoke to them and sent them "quickly" away. His particular mention of Peter betrays him to us. With characteristic magnanimity he loses not a moment in sending to his faithless but penitent friend a virtual assurance that the past was forgiven. As soon as the women had gone, Jesus came forth, and, as I conjecture, found other and suitable garments near by, left there possibly by the soldiers, or by the persons who, having deposited his body the day but one before in the grave, regarded the garments which had come in contact with the dead body as unclean, and thus habited anew Jesus met Mary, and made himself known to her as the fourth Gospel relates.

Nothing can exceed, in artlessness and simplicity, the four accounts of the first appearance of Jesus after his crucifixion. If these qualities are not discernible here, then we must despair of ever being able to distinguish their presence anywhere. The most imperfect of the four is the first, Matthew's, and yet it breathes in every line the spirit of nature. It tells things all at once. It huddles together all the prominent points of the story, just as a child would have done, and thus incidents are confused, rendered coincident, which could have happened only one after the other.

I cannot resist the conclusion, that Matthew's account must have been written down almost on the spot and at the time, so visible to me in this narrative is the impress of this childlike simplicity and naturalness, so faithfully does it represent precisely such impressions as were likely to be among the first received.

So far only have I any insight into this wonderful passage of the history of Jesus. As to the manner and purpose of his return to life, we can only make the feeblest guesses. So much, however, is certain. The resurrection of Jesus, considered as a fact established, far as it is beyond the range of our experience, is not and cannot be a fact out of the Divine order of the world. Anomalous as it appears to us, it is nevertheless, we may be sure, not a departure from that order, but a new and enlightening revelation of it, a fact profoundly natural, throwing light upon the hidden laws of the body and the spirit, upon the nature and philosophy of the soul. — TRANS.]

APPENDIX.

CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL ILLUSTRATIONS.

APPENDIX.

ILLUSTRATIONS.

15. p. 7. The words of Matthew, v. 17 – 20, at variance apparently with the spirit of Christ, have given occasion to many arbitrary and sophistical interpretations. Even *De Wette*[1] has not kept entirely clear from these when he expresses the opinion that, in spirit, i. e. for the purposes of devotion, Christianity has really not abolished but fulfilled the Mosaic ritual. But in verses eighteenth and nineteenth there is nothing said of an attempt on the part of Jesus to fulfil the Mosaic Law, but Jesus declares that not the smallest letter (the Yod), not a point in the Law shall "pass away," i. e. fall, lose its worth and its importance among the members of his Communion. Therefore, as *De Wette* understands the words, Jesus should have said that the *letter* indeed and the points would pass away, i. e. lose their worth and importance, but the *spirit* of the Law would find in his kingdom an ever more and more complete fulfilment. He would thus have said directly the opposite of what the first Evangelist reports him to have said. *Hofmann*[2] interprets the passage in a still more arbitrary manner, when he maintains that it was not any single points of the Law which the Lord sought to enforce or render more severe, but that he had reference to the will of the Lawgiver lying behind them and imprinted upon the manifold details of the Law, but which he did not come to fulfil to the letter, or by any means minutely and externally. This explanation, as every unprejudiced, critical eye must see, is forced upon the text

[1] Erklärung des Evangeliums des Matthäus.

[2] Schriftbeweis, II., 1, 75.

from beginning to end. *Olshausen* is even of the opinion that Jesus designs to say that the whole Old Testament is typical, that he abolishes it as soon as that which it typifies is fully developed, as the blossom perishes in order to complete itself in the fruit.[1] Into such sophistries and distortions does the interpretation of the Scriptures inevitably run, when simple truth is sacrificed to dogmatic theories. The fact that this difficult passage is found only in Matthew is noteworthy. The original declaration of Jesus is given most probably in Luke.[2] In Luke the subject of discourse is the Pharisaic pride, which is an abomination in the sight of God. This pride had its deepest root in the relation of the Pharisees to the Law and the Prophets, as the guardians and chosen interpreters of which they would fain be esteemed. Jesus, on the other hand, means to show that they no longer had any authority to justify themselves by the Law. According to verse sixteenth, the Law was binding only till the time of the Baptist John. With him a new era — the era of the Gospel — had dawned, and now, says Jesus, men press with violence into the Divine kingdom of the Gospel. In connection with this saying, as is commonly understood, Jesus went on to say[3] that it was easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for the smallest point of the Law to fail. But it is clear that verse sixteenth contradicts verse seventeenth. In verse sixteenth Jesus declares that the Law reached its period with the Baptist; the Gospel is a new thing, improving upon the Law; and the fact that every one is pressing into the kingdom announced by Jesus shows that the period of the Law had found its full end. After so explicit a declaration against the Law, how could Jesus have gone on to say that not the smallest point should fail in the Law, which he considered obsolete? The particle δέ in verse seventeenth shows that this verse stands in contradiction to the preceding verse. On this account, the commentators who endeavor to reconcile the two

[1] Biblischer Commentar zu Matt. v. 17–19.

[2] Luke xvi. 15.

[3] Luke xvi. 17.

verses are forced to try to improve the text, as, for example, Marcion, instead of τοῦ νόμου, would read τῶν λόγων μου, and recently *Volkmar*[1] proposes to read τῶν λόγων τοῦ Θεοῦ. Acute as they may be, these are violent solutions. A rational connection between these two verses is made to appear only by supposing that verse seventeenth is not a saying of Jesus, but the opinion of the Pharisees which Jesus was contending against, and which, in opposition to his assertion that the Law and the Prophets had authority only until the time of John, maintained that heaven and earth would pass away before one tittle of the Law should fail. They thus ascribed to the Law in its traditional form an eternal authority. This is abundantly proved to have been a Rabbinical idea.[2] The eighteenth verse is consequently to be understood as a crushing rejoinder of Jesus to the Pharisaic assumption in the seventeenth verse. The Law allows Divorce and second marriage of a divorced woman;[3] the Gospel, on the contrary, declares that whoever repudiates his wife and marries another, or who marries a woman that has been divorced, breaks the marriage vow. Thus, not only in one little point, but in an essential matter, is the Law abolished by the Gospel. The Pharisaic assertion (verse seventeenth) is consequently directly contradicted by the evangelical declaration (verse eighteenth). The third Evangelist probably did not clearly perceive the connection of verse seventeenth with the declarations of Jesus (verses sixteenth and eighteenth); these declarations came to him in a fragmentary form in the Collection of Sayings, and the logical links were wanting. But as Luke, in conformity with his very objective treatment of his documents, took these passages from the Collection, word for word, it is still possible to discern the original connection. On the other hand, it is in keeping with the character of the first Evangelist as

[1] Das Evangelium Marc. p. 151.

[2] Josephus says, c. Apion II. 38: ὁ γοῦν νόμος ἡμῖν ἀθάνατος διαμένει. Matt. v. 17 is found almost in the same words in Schemoth Rabbah, 6: *Nulla litera* aboletur a lege in aeternum, and still oftener in substance.

[3] Deut. xxiv. 1.

a writer, that he should put his own construction upon the connection in which verse seventeenth was uttered by Jesus, and in which it stood perhaps in the Collection of Sayings, — a construction directly at variance with the fundamental position of Jesus towards the Law, but affording a desirable defence against those who might charge Christianity with being in design or in fact antinomistic. The seventeenth verse was literally uttered by Jesus. But nothing is more certain than that in the eighteenth and nineteenth verses he expresses, not his own belief, but only the belief of those to whom he was fundamentally opposed.

16. p. 17. The reference of the Sign of Jonah to the resurrection of Jesus by the first Evangelist, has recently been defended anew, but not with success, by *Meyer*.[1] The fact that the second and third Gospels know nothing of such a reference puts the statement of the first Evangelist in a doubtful light. The declaration of Jesus in the second Gospel,[2] that no sign whatever should be given to that generation, leads us plainly to the conclusion that the point of the declaration is the refusal to work any miracles for the sake of accrediting himself. It is only thus that his reasoning has any point against the demand of his opposers. That generation, craving miracles, caring not for the teachings of Truth, should have no "sign" given to it but the preaching of God's kingdom, which it rejected. And was not this preaching the sign of the awakening and gathering of the true Communion? The arguments, with which *Meyer* seeks to defend his interpretation of the Sign of Jonah as given in the first Evangelist, have very little force. It is said in Matthew[3] of the preaching of Jonah, that, in consequence of it, the Ninevites repented. That the marvellous fortune of the prophet was known to them is not intimated. Hence, in all probability, it was the preaching of Jonah, and not his confinement for three days

[1] Ex. Handbuch zu Matt. xii. 10.
[2] Mark viii. 12.
[3] Matt. xii. 41.

in the belly of the fish, that alone had a significance to the Ninevites. The idea of *Meyer*, that what Jesus says of the "sign" ends with the fortieth verse, is a mere fancy. On the contrary, the comparison of Jesus with Jonah is not ended there; it concludes, not, as *Meyer* erroneously maintains, with the designation of himself by Jesus as the antitype of Jonah, but with his representing himself as a higher authority than the old prophet (ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Ἰωνᾶ ὧδε). Thus it was not to Jonah confined in the fish that Jesus compared himself in the grave, but it was the inferior significance of the preaching of Jonah that Jesus compared with the superior import of his own preaching, and what he condemned the Pharisees for so severely was that, while the Ninevites were moved to repent by the inferior teacher, they, the Pharisees, were unmoved by a greater. The future δοθήσεται in reference to the preaching of Jesus was taken by the first Evangelist from the original Mark,[1] and in Luke[2] it appears in its right place: There will be no sign given to this generation but the sign of Jonah (the preaching of the Gospel), i. e. the future stands for the logical possibility. *Meyer* indeed questions whether Jonah were a "sign" to the Ninevites, but — apart from the fact that, in the first Gospel[3] the Ninevites are set before the Pharisees as an example, and, as is declared, are to rise up in judgment against them at the last day — Luke gives the correct explanation on this point: καθὼς γὰρ ἐγένετο Ἰωνᾶς τοῖς Νινευίταις σημεῖον.[4] According to the first Evangelist, the reasoning of Jesus would have had no logical point. What he condemns is the impenitence of the Pharisees notwithstanding his preaching. They demand a sign (miracle); had he replied to this demand, that there should be no other miracle shown them than his own resurrection, he would not only have said what was not correct, — as, before his resurrection, he had wrought many other miracles, — but, in this case, it would not at all appear why he referred to the repentance of the Ninevites as an effect of

[1] Mark viii. 12. [2] Luke xi. 29. [3] Matt. xii. 41.
[4] Luke xi. 30.

the preaching of Jonah. In this case, he would rather have said: As the Ninevites repented in consequence of Jonah's confinement in the fish, so will a similar sign — the resurrection — be given to the Pharisees, that they also may repent. But what Jesus designed to say was that, as the Ninevites repented without miracles, purely in consequence of the preaching of Jonah, so the Pharisees must be converted without miracles, in consequence of the preaching of the Gospel.

[When the circumstances under which the demand was made upon Jesus for a "sign" are duly considered, when it is recollected that his own disciples on one occasion inquired of him what would be the "sign" of his coming, and that the Apostle Paul says that a "sign" was the one thing required by the Jews, we have reason to suppose that it was not a mere miracle that was wanted, but a sign or miracle conformable to the Jewish idea of the Messiah. See note *b.* to ch. xii. p. 28. — TRANS.]

17. p. 44. There is scarcely an Evangelical narrative so hard to be understood literally as that of the Transfiguration of Jesus. To appeal with *Ebrard*,[1] in order to save the story, to the fact that with God nothing is impossible, is to confess one's self philosophically bankrupt. *Neander*[2] likewise is embarrassed by the idea of an apparition of spirits on the mount of transfiguration. But the supposition that it was all a vision, passing in sleep before the disciples, has no better historical foundation; for how should all the three disciples have dreamed the same thing, and, upon awaking, have all regarded their dream as an actual fact? The supposition of a dream finds support, moreover, only in the third Gospel,[3] and the account there shows traces of a later tradition. According to the oldest narrative,[4] the disciples were all awake. The idea that

[1] Wissenschaftliche Kritik, p. 444.
[2] Leben Jesu Christi, 1, 516. [3] Luke ix. 32. [4] Mark ix. 4.

there were really two men, not Moses and Elias, but unknown persons, who talked with Jesus on the mountain,[1] is opposed by the fact that the tradition asserts a supernatural appearance, and gives the two known names of Moses and Elias. Hence there remains for us only the supposition of an early legend, by which the communications of Jesus to his disciples concerning the relation of his Messianic work to the Law and the Prophets were popularized, and the imaginative power of Jesus was manifested, whereby he was able to reanimate for his disciples and bring within the sphere of their vision, the heroic figures of those old personages, so illustrious in religious history. Even Mark adopts this tradition, already, in his time, universally circulated in the Apostolic community. Thus understood, the event loses nothing of its truly historical element; while it receives an almost childish character, if we suppose that it must have served Jesus as an opportunity to communicate to the fathers of the Old Covenant the blessed intelligence of his readiness to save them by his death.[2] From *Ebrard's* orthodox point of view, this intelligence was altogether superfluous, as the fathers of the Old Covenant had foreseen in the clearest manner and foretold the Messiah and his work of Redemption, and therefore were fully able to communicate the intelligence to others, and were by no means under the necessity of coming down to earth to receive it. Least worthy of assent is the rationalizing supernaturalism, by means of which *Meyer* endeavors to render the story in some degree plausible to a believing understanding. According to this mode of explanation, the appearance of Moses is pronounced impossible, because his resurrection had not taken place.[3] That the three disciples should have the same "vision" at the same moment, is ascribed to a "divine influence." But why should not God, to whom nothing is impossible, have been able to create an external apparition, as well as a vision to three individuals at the same time? Besides, there is no

[1] *Hase,* Leben Jesu, p. 161.
[2] *Ebrard,* p. 438.
[3] Ex. Handbuch zu Matt. xvii. 1–8.

reason apparent for giving (with *Meyer*) the preference to the first Gospel over the second. The sunlike splendor of the countenance of Jesus, in Matthew,[1] is an embellishment, like the snow-white shining of his garments in Mark.[2] According to this Evangelist, at the very beginning of the vision Peter knew not what to say, which is more credible than that it was not until the voice was heard that the disciples were seized with fear, as Matthew reports.[3] The way in which Jesus is stated to have treated the three disciples, quieting them by laying hold on them, appears to belong to the later tradition.

18. p. 74. It was at the great decisive moment of his departure for Jerusalem that Jesus gave utterance to the saying extolling the simple-minded, the babes.[4] Only a mind fettered by dogmatic considerations can gather from this passage that Jesus intended therein to give a metaphysical explanation of the higher quality of his own personality. Of the wise and prudent, the theologues and metaphysicians of his time, Jesus would fain, on the contrary, know nothing; it was the "babes" only whom he pronounced blessed. It is true, he designates himself in this passage as the "Son" of the Heavenly Father, a designation singular in the Synoptics. He had then attained the height of his personal consciousness, a height which until then he had not reached. The weight of his words lies in the declaration that the Father had given all things to him. When *Meyer* pronounces every limitation of *πάντα* arbitrary, he unfortunately fails to explain what is to be understood by an absolute resignation of "all things" to the Son by the Father. For "all things" possessed by the Father would include his omnipotence, his omniscience, the preservation and government of the world, &c. In Luke (in the first Gospel all connection is wanting) the words of Jesus are connected with the eighteenth verse of the tenth chapter. He had previously declared that Satan had fallen from

[1] Matt. xvii. 2.
[2] Mark ix. 3.
[3] Matt. xvii. 6.
[4] Luke x. 21; Matt. xi. 25.

heaven, he had empowered the disciples to tread on serpents and scorpions without receiving injury, and given them the assurance also that spirits should be subject to them. When he connects herewith the still further assurance that "all things" were given to him by the Father, he can have in view only the things relating to his own work, the building up of the divine kingdom. As to the reading of the received text, in which the knowledge of the Son through the Father precedes this assurance,[1] the conjecture of *Hilgenfeld* has much weight, namely, that the original text, as Marcion had it, read thus: Οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς, καὶ τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ, καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.[2] It is the new consciousness of God in him that Jesus keeps present above all things to the minds of his disciples, and it is only in a subordinate way that there connects itself therewith the new consciousness of his Sonship, created in him through the revelation made by God of himself in Jesus, whereby the Son appears as he into whose hands the Father had given "all things."

19. p. 79. The received reading, Καὶ εἶπεν, οὐκ οἴδατε οἵου πνεύματός ἐστε ὑμεῖς,[3] gives us, it is true, a perfectly good sense; and is entirely in keeping with the character of Jesus, but it is so destitute of authority,[4] that it must be rejected as a later addition. How it got into the text is by no means unaccountable (as *Meyer* thinks): it was probably by oral tradition. It is an arbitrary explanation, on the other hand, to attribute the omission of it to the error of transcribers, or to a pietistic consideration for Elias.

20. p. 96. That the Lord's Prayer is not in its right place in the Sermon on the Mount, is admitted by *Neander*,[5] and

[1] Luke x. 22; Matt. xi. 27.

[2] *Zeller's* Theol. Jahrbücher, 1853, p. 202; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evangelien, p. 76, 185.

[3] Luke ix. 55.

[4] The Codex Sinaiticus also wants these words.

[5] Leben Jesu Christi, p. 230, Note.

Ewald likewise acknowledges Luke's report of it to be evidently the oldest.[1] It is only through a blind zeal to harmonize the Gospels that one can suffer himself to go so far as to suppose (with *Meyer*) that the prayer was given upon two different occasions.[2] The form of the prayer in the first Gospel is evidently a later amplification of an older, original form. It is quite natural that additions should have gathered around the original prayer, especially as the Lord's Prayer very soon found a permanent place in Christian worship, and hence assumed a liturgical character. Such additions are the ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, joined to πάτερ,[3] and the doxology at the end. Amplifying additions are,[4] γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου, ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς, and[5] ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ. The first of these reminds us of the liturgical address πάτερ ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, and is a more definite form of the petition for the coming of the kingdom of God, inasmuch as it intimates *how* the kingdom of God shall come. The second softens the offensive idea that might seem to be contained in the prayer to our Heavenly Father not to lead us into temptation. The historical situation which introduces the Prayer in Luke illustrates it. From the fifty-first verse of the ninth chapter on, the account of the journey of Jesus is interspersed with stories of the time spent by him in Judea; and what is related after that time, occurred upon the journey from Samaria and during the last abode of Jesus with his disciples in Judea and Jerusalem. As the scene in Bethany[6] is related somewhat at length, Jesus must have given the Prayer to his disciples after his arrival in Judea. At all events, most of the sayings contained in the eleventh chapter of Luke were uttered during the last sojourn of Jesus in Judea.

21. p. 110. In reference to the story of the Cursing of the fig-tree, *Strauss* has justly observed, that what tradition

[1] Die drei ersten Evangelien, p. 286.
[2] Ex. Handbuch zu Matt. vi. 9, and Luke xi. 1.
[3] Matt. vi. 9.
[4] Matt. vi. 10.
[5] Matt. vi. 13.
[6] Luke x. 38.

found as an apothegm and a parable it converted into a real event.[1] Neander[2] also concedes that the right understanding of the parabolic act[3] is found in the parable related in the third Gospel,[4] and is even of opinion that Jesus uttered the parable on this occasion. In this case, it would hardly seem to be necessary to endeavor to make the miracle less by representing the decay of the tree as having commenced long before, and its final destruction as only accelerated by the influence of Jesus. Whoever, in opposition to the first two evangelists, sees with *Meyer* in the withering of the fig-tree, on the one side, a miraculous effect of the will of Jesus, and on the other, a prophetic, symbolical representation of the punishment of moral unfruitfulness, mixes together, in contradiction to the text, two entirely different interpretations of one and the same fact, and besides, taking an honestly human view of the person of Jesus, cannot justify, either dogmatically or morally, his exerting a destructive influence upon a barren tree.

22. p. 124. Since *Lücke's* thorough examination of the section of John vii. 53 – viii. 11., it is pretty generally acknowledged that "the authenticity of the passage (*Perikope*) as the work of John, if not to be decisively rejected, is yet in a high degree doubtful, and that recent criticism has decided fully against its genuineness."[5] We cannot, however, maintain with *Hase*,[6] that the narrative shows in itself merely the style of a better sort of apocryphal writing, and lacks those marks which commonly distinguish what has actually occurred from what is invented. The apparent lightness with which Jesus here forgives[7] a heinous sin,—upon the condition, it is true, of the most thorough repentance,—early gave an offensive character to this narrative; and for this reason, it would

[1] Leben Jesu, Bd. II. § 100; Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk, p. 515.

[2] Leben Jesu Christi, p. 382.

[3] Mark xi. 12; Matt. xxi. 18.

[4] Luke xiii. 6.

[5] Commentar über das Evangelium des Joh. Vol. II. p. 245 *et seq.*

[6] Leben Jesu, p. 155.

[7] John viii. 11.

seem, it found no place in the Synoptics. For that it found its way into John's Gospel from a quarter connected with the Synoptics, *Baur* has correctly supposed.[1] If it were received into the Gospel as a later addition, as its being wanting in some important MSS.[2] intimates, then the fact that it was so received as an addition shows how highly it was esteemed as an authentic tradition of the time following that of the apostles. Its high age is also proved by the fact that it existed in the Gospel of the Hebrews, and that Papias appears to have had knowledge of it.[3] At least, the words, *ἱστορίαν περὶ γυναικὸς ἐπὶ πολλαῖς ἁμαρτίαις διαβληθείσης*, give no reason for doubting the identity of the narrative, as the designation here is, in all probability, not exact.

But we cannot easily understand how this story should have been invented purely in the interest of the idea that the power of every sin is broken by the consciousness that men have of their own sinfulness. It is not in the fact that, among the Jews, adultery was generally punished with strangling, that the main difficulty lies[4]; since upon qualified adultery, especially, the criminal transgression of a betrothed woman, the punishment of stoning was pronounced[5]; and the case would seem to be of this character, as *Meyer* has justly remarked, from the words *τὰς τοιαύτας*.[6] But that the Pharisees, in consequence of the awakening of their consciences, immediately upon the question of Jesus[7] confess themselves beaten and slink silently away; that, as *Baur* expresses it, they actually acknowledge in such a way, in the presence of Jesus, the Christian principle of the consciousness of sin, seems rather to stand in the way of the credibility of the narrative. But it is to be observed that it was not specially the design of the Pharisees to procure the condemnation of the woman by Jesus. For in this case they would have had to remind him of

[1] Kritische Untersuchungen, p. 170.
[2] E. g. in the Codex Sinaiticus.
[3] *Euseb.* Hist. Eccles. III. 40. [4] Lev. xx. 10; Deut. xxii. 22.
[5] Deut. xxii. 23. [6] John viii. 5. [7] John viii. 7.

the great difference between notorious transgression and the secret sins of the conscience. What they wanted was to draw from Jesus an answer, which they might use against him, — a declaration either against the Mosaic (or Roman) law, or for it; a condemnation of the tradition of the fathers, or a condemnation of himself and his own principles. And this design they failed to accomplish, as Jesus, in his striking way, as in the case of the tribute money, left undecided the special point to which their question pointed, and, instead of remaining in the unfavorable position of a person put to the question, placed his opponents in this predicament. If they were justly embarrassed by this turn in the interview, they were far more so by the words with which he searched and stung their consciences. At such moments every thing depends upon the impression of personal power; and how great that was that Jesus exercised on those around him, the Gospels furnish sufficient evidence.

This narrative is in remarkable keeping with the other attempts made by the Pharisees to embarrass Jesus in regard to the conjugal relation. That they took this position towards him without any external occasion leading them so to do, is not readily to be supposed. An incident like this here narrated could very naturally lead to further attempts to entrap Jesus. The Pharisees, especially after the blow they had received, might well feel a strong impulse to return it.

23. p. 138. It is an entirely false representation of *E. Renan's*,[1] when he maintains that, in regard to the poor and to poverty, Jesus taught the doctrine of the Ebionites, le pur ébionisme, la doctrine, que les pauvres seuls seront sauvés, que le règne des pauvres va venir. This alleged goût exagéré de pauvreté,[2] — by which Jesus is affirmed to have been ruled, and in consequence of which he is said to have declared, que ne rien posséder fut le véritable état evangélique, — is nowhere to be found, in the form maintained,

[1] Vie de Jésus, p. 179. [2] Ib. p. 182.

in the teachings of Jesus. He never expressed himself to the effect that the rich as such were to be excluded from the true Communion, as seems to be thought by *E. Renan;* but he simply declared a fact to which experience bears witness, namely, that it is very hard for the rich to fulfil the conditions indispensable to admission into the divine kingdom, and this, not indeed on account of their riches, but because of the false disposition of their hearts in regard to worldly good. Besides, it must not be overlooked that the declarations of Jesus concerning the moral dangers of wealth were made during his last abode in Judea, consequently at a point of time when it had become the indispensable duty of his disciples to renounce utterly all dependence upon earthly goods and devote themselves wholly to the service of the Gospel. That the saying, moreover, of Jesus in Matthew[1] and in Luke[2] has suffered a distortion of its original meaning is a fact not to be denied, and that Ebionitic traditions occasioned the change is at least very probable. In the treatment of parallel passages in the Gospels, Renan's book is deficient in the acuteness indispensable in the department of comparative criticism.

24. p. 170. In no point does the difference between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics present itself more prominently than in regard to the immediate cause of the criminal process instituted against Jesus. The Fourth Gospel so represents the incidents preceding the arrest of Jesus that the extraordinary excitement caused by the raising of Lazarus from the dead would seem to have determined the Pharisees to put an immediate stop to the career of Jesus.[3] So great was the exasperation of the leaders of the theocratic party at the effect of the raising of Lazarus, that the life even of Lazarus was threatened.[4] It has justly been considered very remarkable that the Synoptics not only know nothing of this cause of the last decisive

[1] Matt. xix. 23.
[2] Luke xviii. 24.
[3] John xi. 46.
[4] John xii. 10.

measures of the Sanhedrim against Jesus, but appear even to have had no knowledge of the resurrection of Lazarus. But it is not so easy as *Lücke*[1] thinks to account for the absence of this event in the Synoptics by their ignorance of the fact. Luke was so far from being unacquainted with the events that took place during the last sojourn of Jesus in Judea, that he has drawn peculiar accounts of them of from some tolerably full record, left unused by the other Evangelists. One who was so particularly acquainted with the final events in Jerusalem that the anecdote of the widow's mite[2] did not escape him must have known of the raising of Lazarus, if it really took place. On this account, apologists like *Meyer*[3] have of late assumed it as unquestionable (!) that the Synoptics were acquainted with the raising of Lazarus, and have sought to explain their silence about it by reference to the alleged Galilean limits, to which those elder historical compositions were restricted. But this attempt at solving the difficulty is rendered unavailing by the synoptic narrative of the healing of the blind man at Jericho,[4] and by a number of other accounts of the last labors of Jesus in Judea.

It certainly does not follow from the fact that there is no mention of the raising of Lazarus in the first three Gospels, that it is a pure fabrication. We have shown that the last and only sojourn of Jesus in Judea must have been of longer duration than appears at first sight in the Synoptics. That Jesus at that time wrought cures among the people, the Synoptics themselves sufficiently attest.[5] That he effected a miraculous cure of a man by the name of Lazarus in Bethany is, in itself, not improbable. The parable of the poor Lazarus also, who lay sick at the rich man's gate,[6] passed over into the Synoptic tradition. That from such elements, after

[1] Commentar zum Evang. des Joh. Vol. II. p. 475.
[2] Luke xxi. 1.
[3] Ex. Handbuch zum Evang. des Joh. p. 379.
[4] Matt. x. 46; Matt. xx. 29; Luke xviii. 35.
[5] Matt. xix. 2; Luke xvii. 11.
[6] Luke xvi. 20.

the lapse of seventy or eighty years, at a considerable distance from the scene of the events, a narrative like that in the Fourth Gospel[1] might form itself, is just as probable as it is certain that it cannot now be determined what actually occurred. It is not impossible that the Lazarus "carried by angels to Abraham's bosom,"[2] the symbol of the poor, oppressed people redeemed by Jesus, became transformed in the later circle of the Ephesian traditions into a Lazarus raised by Jesus, and, as a witness of the great works done by Jesus, giving occasion to the Pharisees for their last decisive measures against him. According to the Synoptics, it was the purification of the Temple by Jesus that alone was the immediate cause of his arrest.[3] This act of Jesus the Fourth Gospel relates as having taken place upon his first coming to the Feast in Jerusalem.[4] The more liberal commentators, like *Lücke*, acknowledge the improbability of this event's having happened twice, — at the beginning and at the close of the career of Jesus, — not only under precisely the same circumstances, but also in almost the same way; and, assuming the fourth Evangelist to have been an eye-witness, they decide in favor of his account.

There is nothing, in fact, in itself more improbable, nothing more at variance with the originality which marks all the acts of Jesus than that he should have done the very same things at different times in the same place. And it is just as improbable that they who were so much disturbed by it should have quietly submitted to a proceeding that had so arbitrary and violent an appearance. We have already remarked, how little it is to be supposed that Jesus at the very beginning of his public career, before his Messianic consciousness was awakened or his fame established in the popular mind, should have done so bold an act under the very eyes of the Sanhedrim in the capital of Judea, — to say nothing of the fact, to which the Synoptics bear witness,

[1] John xi.

[2] Luke xvi. 22; *Baur*, Krit. Untersuchungen, p. 249.

[3] Mark xi. 18; Matt. xxi. 15; Luke xix. 47.

[4] John ii. 13.

that it was only toward the close of his public life that Jesus entered the city of Jerusalem. But what excited the theocratic party so violently against him was not only his interference with the police of the Temple and the disturbance of the public peace within those sacred precincts, but what was said by him on the occasion.[1] These utterances of Jesus, in conformity with the occasion that suggested them, could have related only to the Temple and to the significance which the Temple had for the divine kingdom established by him; and we have shown in our exposition that in all probability Jesus used the two passages from the prophets[2] adduced by him against the old theocratic Temple, and in favor of the new spiritual Temple founded by him. Here the Ephesian traditions have preserved the emphatic word employed by Jesus, which the Synoptics have put into the mouths of the witnesses who appeared against him when he was examined by a deputation of the Sanhedrim.[3] They have not ascribed it directly to Jesus, out of fear of the misunderstandings that might possibly be connected with it.

The Fourth Gospel, from its peculiar point of view, had no such tender considerations for the Jewish Christian party; but even in this Gospel there appears to be some hesitation in representing Jesus as aiming outright to destroy the Jewish Temple. Accordingly a mystical, allegorical sense is given to that striking word of his, a sense which he knew nothing of, namely, that it had reference to his resurrection on the third day after his crucifixion. In stating that Jesus was not so understood at the time,[4] the fourth Evangelist shows that this was an interpretation of his own. Had Jesus really meant to say, "Kill me and within three days I will rise again,"[5] he could not have expressed himself in a manner more artificial and more unintelligible. But the

[1] Mark xi. 18: Πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἐξεπλήσσετο ἐπι τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ.

[2] Is. lvi. 7; Jerem. vii. 11.

[3] Mark xiv. 58; Matt. xxvi. 61; xxvii. 40. [4] John ii. 22.

[5] *Meyer*, Ex. Handbuch zum Evang. des Joh. p. 122.

interpretation of the Evangelist (who is obviously, according to our views, not to be confounded with the Apostle John) is otherwise irreconcilable with the New Testament representation of the "body" of Christ. Nowhere in the New Testament is the body of Jesus that died and was raised again represented as the "real God's temple" (as *Meyer* has it); but by the symbolical expression, "body of Christ," is meant the Church. If we suppose (with *Meyer*) that, with the Temple before him, Jesus, when he uttered the language under consideration, pointed to himself, such a gesture would not only have had very little propriety, but it would be unintelligible why the disciples did not understand it, or, if they did not understand it, why they did not ask for an explanation. We are not prevented from supposing that the allusion in the words of Jesus is to the approaching destruction of the theocratic form of worship and the building of the new Spiritual Temple, by the fact that the building of the new temple took place only gradually. With the destruction of the old Temple the new one was substantially in existence, ready built and complete.[1] That by the words ἐγερῶ αὐτόν the identity of the old Temple with the new was asserted by Jesus, cannot correctly be said. In this case it must have read τὸν αὐτόν. Equally incorrect is the doctrine that Jesus raised himself, as it is his Heavenly Father who is always represented as raising him from the dead. But neither is the declaration of Jesus to be understood hypothetically of the desecration of the Temple, as if he had said: "Suppose you not only desecrate the Temple but destroy it utterly, I have power to build it up again in the shortest time." The meaning of Jesus is concessive rather: "Instead of pursuing your work of defiling the Temple, destroy it; it has now become useless since the time of the Baptist, and in the shortest time I will build a new temple, the spiritual temple of my kingdom, for Jews and for Gentiles."

[1] See Hosea vi. 2. The words of the prophet likewise relate to a *spiritual* Israel renewed by Jehovah.

[It is somewhat surprising that the Commentators should be so much disturbed by the absence of any mention of Lazarus in the Synoptics, when it is so generally supposed by the learned that the Synoptics are hardly anything more than *compilations*, records made up of such previously existing documents as were within the reach of the compilers. Consequently in times when written works were multiplied and circulated very slowly, is it not easy to imagine that there may have been various reasons why the story of Lazarus did not become known to the authors of the original records, — of those documents of which our Gospels are composed, — and which bear strong marks of having been composed *very early?* They (the Gospel narratives) seem, for the most part, to have all the character of first, fresh impressions of the events recorded. At all events, no difficulty in accounting for the silence of the first three Gospels in regard to Lazarus can for a moment outweigh the "historical traits," — the internal evidence of truth, — which mark the narrative in the Fourth Gospel. I cannot but observe that, if our learned author had appreciated this evidence, he never could have suggested that the story of the raising of Lazarus may have grown out of the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. Could I entertain such a suggestion, I could as easily believe the whole history to be a similar invention.

In regard to the purification of the Temple, I think Dr. Schenkel exaggerates both the boldness of the act and its effect upon the enemies of Jesus. It was a bold act, but it was a very popular act also; and it is highly probable that it was the people rather than Jesus before whom the traders retreated so precipitately. I see no evidence of the offence which our author alleges it gave to the Pharisees. It seems rather to have overawed them. They asked Jesus immediately afterwards for a "sign," which request, as I conceive, intimates that a sign was all that was wanted to induce them to recognize his authority. It was not a mere miracle but a Messianic sign that they wanted, such a sign as he could not give. — TRANS.]

25. p. 191. One cannot more entirely misunderstand the design of Jesus in arguing against the Jewish theologues from Ps. cx. 1, than by adopting the view taken by *Meyer*, namely, that Jesus aimed to make the Pharisees, whose assaults were directed only against his Messiahship, sensible that they did not even know of *what nature* the Messiah was, although Ps. cx. would "so easily" (!) have taught them.[1] *Neander* was on the right way to an understanding of the passage, when he remarked[2] that, if we hold the form of words found in Mark to be the original form, we are led to conclude that Jesus quoted Ps. cx. to oppose the idea that the Messiah must be of the lineage of David, and in order to assert his Messiahship against those who found in him no evidence of his descent from David. But the erroneous idea of Mark's literary dependence, rendered universally prevalent by Griesbach's hypothesis, together with his concurrence in the common opinion that Jesus was a descendant of David, prevented Neander from admitting the truth.

The fact that Paul speaks of the descent of Jesus from David as a settled matter[3] proves nothing against our view of the case. The Apostle proceeds upon the supposition, received in the Apostolic community and resting upon passages of the Old Testament, according to which the descent of Jesus from David and even from Abraham passed for a self-evident proof of his Messianic dignity.[4] *Bleek* thinks it "might easily seem" that, in referring to Ps. cx., Jesus intended to intimate that the idea of the Messiah as a descendant of David was not reconcilable with the designation of the Messiah as the Lord of David, i. e. it might appear to be the design of Jesus to dispute the opinion that the Messiah was the Son of David.[5] By the contrary remark that "it is, however, not provable," the opposite truth is surely not disproved.

[1] Ex. Handbuch zu Matt. xxii. 41–46.
[2] Leben Jesu Christi, p. 606.
[3] Rom. i. 3; ix. 5.
[4] Gal. iii. 16.
[5] Synoptische Erklärung, II. p. 340.

The fact that Jesus was not a descendant of David appears, according to the Fourth Gospel, to have really stood very much in the way of a more general recognition of his Messiahship.[1] Had he had grounds for holding himself to be of the lineage of David, he would necessarily have been bound to remove the obstacle to the universal acknowledgment of him by appealing to the fact of his descent. That he made no such appeal shows the supposition to be well-grounded that he made no claim of relationship to the royal house of David. According to the original form of the words in Mark, whom Luke follows in substance, Jesus took pains to meet the objection which was made by the Jewish theologians to his Messiahship, and which was based upon his low origin, and especially upon the want in his family of the blood of David, by a very simple and popular mode of reasoning: — since David called the Messiah his Lord, he could not have expected the Messiah to be one of his sons, i. e. of his posterity; for no father, especially with Hebrew ideas of family order, would speak of his son, — no ancestor of his descendant, — as his Lord. The first Evangelist had not the key to the words of Jesus, and he understands Jesus as simply putting a puzzling question to the Pharisees gathered around him, in order to reduce them to silence by the difficulty of finding an answer; but, according to this Gospel, the only fitting answer they could have given would have been: If such be the case, then the Messiah cannot be expected to come from the family of David.

26. p. 197. The words in Matt. xxiii. 3, in which Jesus is reported to have bidden the disciples to do and to keep all that the Pharisees said (prescribed), are a Jewish-Christian addition by the same hand that added the eighteenth and nineteenth verses of the fifth chapter of this same Gospel. What *Meyer* means when, in defence of the originality of the saying of Jesus, he remarks[2] that Jesus here

[1] John vii. 41 *et seq.*

[2] Ex. Handbuch über das Evangelium des Matthäus, p. 417.

leaves out of sight the abuse of their office (the office of instruction?) by the Pharisees, as it existed *in praxi*, is to us unintelligible. *Bleek*, on the contrary, very justly observes that Jesus could not surely have recommended observance of all the Pharasaic precepts, as in the same discourse he denounces the Pharisees on account of their casuistical distinctions.[1] But when *Bleek* is of opinion — although the opposite is positively expressed — that Jesus nevertheless meant to be understood only as saying comparatively that the teaching of the Pharisees which urged the importance of holiness of life (?) was more commendable than their practice, he puts into the mouth of Jesus something entirely different from what he actually sought to say in the passage referred to. As to the occasion of the denunciatory discourse of Jesus, Mark gives us the true account when he represents Jesus as addressing it to the people in the Temple. The Jews were to decide either against the Pharisees or against him. A position between the two had become morally untenable. That the first Evangelist represents the discourse as addressed to the disciples,[2] is explained by the fact that he has put together several of the anti-Pharisaic discourses of Jesus taken from the time of his last abode in Jerusalem. Luke, who has here taken a passage parallel to that of Matthew from the Collection of Sayings, is in error as to the occasion;[3] for that Jesus broke out upon his host in such a way as he would seem from verse forty to have done, is altogether improbable. From men such as are there described Jesus would hardly have accepted invitations.

27. p. 212. The original substance of the so-called eschatological discourse of Jesus is preserved in Mark and Luke, while in Matthew it is considerably amplified. The exclamation of admiring wonder which the sight of the

[1] Matt. xxiii. 16. Comp. *Bleek*, Synoptische Erklärung, Vol. II. p. 342.

[2] Matt. xxiii. 1. [3] Comp. Luke xi. 37 with Matt. xxiii. 25.

Temple drew from the disciples, and which led Jesus to disclose to them the catastrophe impending over the Temple and the city, has been erroneously omitted by the first Evangelist. The question as to how far Jesus could have known the coming fate of Jerusalem is answered, from our point of view, by reference to his deep insight into the corrupt and effete condition of the theocracy, and to his full appreciation of the increasing restlessness of the nation under the Roman supremacy. He thus saw that the speedy destruction of the Jewish State had become an historical necessity. He was not indeed possessed of an absolute knowledge of the fate of Jerusalem,[1] and therefore his predictions are not to be taken to the letter. He was, in the main, however, perfectly correct when he declared the destruction of Jerusalem and of the Temple service to be so near that persons then living would witness it.

The special difficulty of the eschatological discourse begins only at the point at which Jesus announces his own return, and indeed in immediate connection with the destruction of Jerusalem. All attempts made in the interests of the apologists to deny such a connection are sophistical and deserve no refutation. According to Mark,[2] the return of the Son of Man was to take place ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν ἐκείνην; according to Matthew,[3] εὐθέως μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν. In the Gospel of Luke, to whom the destruction of Jerusalem was a past event, it first appears[4] that a considerable interval was to elapse ἄχρι οὗ πληρωθῶσι καιροὶ ἐθνῶν. That thus, according to the Synoptics, Jesus must have been in an error if he expressed himself as they say, there can be no doubt. Although, in accordance with free historical criticism, there is no ground for denying the possibility of such an error in Jesus, yet there are not wanting considerations that forbid the supposition. The idea that the Messiah was to establish his kingdom amidst mira-

[1] [Did he not declare in so many words that his knowledge of the coming event was limited? Mark xiii. 32; Matt. xxiv. 36. Trans.]

[2] Mark xiii. 24. [3] Matt. xxiv. 29. [4] Luke xxi. 24.

cles and signs from heaven, with great splendor and celestial pomp, was entirely in the spirit of the Jewish theocracy, but not at all in keeping with the spirit and character of Jesus and the Communion founded by him. Jesus had indeed, as we have shown, set forth with the greatest distinctness his idea of the divine kingdom as a moral and spiritual condition of things, in opposition to the theocratic idea of a temporal kingdom of heaven. But had he, notwithstanding, taught that, some years after his departure to his Heavenly Father, he would descend from heaven to erect an outward worldly empire, it would have been simply giving in to the theocratic error which he had spent his whole life and labor in combating, i. e. he would have placed himself in irreconcilable contradiction to his own great work and to all the purposes of his mission. As we have seen, the disciples did not put to him any question relative to his return in the body; and although *Bleek*,[1] for example, considers it probable that such a question was put by them, yet the supposition merely comes from his prejudice in favor of the credibility of the first Gospel. The discourse of Jesus is taken up exclusively with the doom impending over Jerusalem and the theocracy; some hints of the future of his kingdom are incidentally connected therewith.

What expressions he used in foretelling the triumph of his cause, closely connected as it was with the downfall of the theocracy, we are not now able to determine. It is not impossible that, in order to a vivid presentment of his idea, he may have availed himself of a figuratively prophetic style of speech, like that employed in the books of Daniel and Enoch in regard to the glorious exaltation of the ideal Israel. But that the eschatological discourses of Jesus were conceived in a purely spiritual sense, the fourth Gospel assures us.[2] There lie before us, in fact, two representations of the eschatological discourses of Jesus: 1. the report of the first three Gospels, with its high Jewish coloring; and 2.

[1] Synoptische Erklärung, II. p. 352.

[2] John xiii. 31 – xvii. 26.

the report of the fourth Gospel, imbued with the universality (*Universalismus*) of the Gentile-Christian mode of thought. Since the idea of the kingdom of God, as set forth according to the Synoptics by Jesus, was of an essentially moral and spiritual nature, and since it was precisely this idea of it that brought him into collision with the theocracy, we are fully justified in adopting the second representation, and in putting the sensuous, apocalyptic coloring of this discourse to the account of the Palestinian tradition.

28. p. 219. It is questionable whether we are authorized to consider the anointing of the person of Jesus, related by Luke (vii. 36), as one and the same with the incident mentioned in Mark xiv. 3, Matt. xxvi. 6, and John xii. 1. When an event is told twice in the Gospels, substantially under the same or tolerably similar circumstances, it is very natural to suppose that it happened really only once, and has been variously related by tradition. On this account, *Schleiermacher*,[1] *Ewald*,[2] and *Bleek*[3] have with justice assumed that these two narratives are at bottom one and the same, and that Luke has given to the story too early a place in the history. If, as *Bleek* remarks, Luke, by the position of the narrative in his Gospel, gives us the impression that the scene of the event was in Galilee, then in this case Luke, misled by a false pragmatism (*Pragmatismus*), has certainly misplaced a narrative, drawn from his Jewish sources, when he places it in the ante-Judaistic period of the Saviour's labors.[4] The similarity of the two stories appears, however, not only in the name of the host, Simon,[5] and in the fact that, in all the Gospels, it is a

[1] Ueber die Schriften des Lucas, p. 110.

[2] Die drei ersten Evangelien, p. 342; Geschichte Christus, p. 422.

[3] Synoptische Erklärung, II. p. 111.

[4] The words, vii. 34, "The son of man is come eating and drinking," suggested to Luke the idea of introducing at this point an account of the entertainment at the Pharisee's house.

[5] Luke vii. 40; Mark xiv. 3; Matt. xxvi. 6.

woman that is related to have anointed Jesus,[1] but also in the further circumstance that the Evangelists all unite in stating that the persons present murmured at the act. The greatest difference between Luke and the other Evangelists appears in the fact, that in Luke the woman is a sinner, who thus expresses her reverence for Jesus and her sorrow for her sins, while in the other Gospels the woman is a loving disciple of Jesus (in the fourth Gospel it is Mary of Bethany), who desires before his death to give him a token of her love consecrating him to death. The difference is best explained by the fact that the third Evangelist, having lost the connection of the incident with the near death of Jesus, appears to have concluded that such an act as this of the woman was appropriate only in a sinner.

[This note presents a striking instance of the painfully *circumstantial* character of German biblical criticism, its strong tendency to dwell upon superficial matter-of-fact points of agreement or difference, to the overlooking of the far more vital moral consistencies of the evangelical history. There are no two events recorded in the Gospels essentially more truly different than these two which are here decided to be one and the same. So entirely distinct are they in their vital moral import, that it is far more likely that the subordinate details in which they resemble each other have become mixed and confounded together in the Gospels, than that they are one and the same incident. TRANS.]

29. p. 240. What the precise words were that Jesus used in the distribution of the bread and wine at the institution of the Supper, the variations in the evangelical tradition render it difficult to determine. The words of Mark in the giving of the bread are, Λάβετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου,[2] and in the giving of the wine, Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν. Then fol-

[1] According to John xii. 3, Mary of Bethany.

[2] Mark xiv. 22.

lows the declaration of Jesus, that he will no more drink of the fruit of the vine until that day when he will drink it new in the kingdom of God. In Matthew the λάβετε at the distribution of the bread is followed by φάγετε.[1] Luke leaves out the imperatives λάβετε and φάγετε; but we have in his Gospel the addition, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον, and the injunction, τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.[2] With this the relation of the Apostle Paul[3] substantially agrees. In the distribution of the wine, Matthew adds the requirement, πίνετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες, with the addition of εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν to ἐκχυννόμενον.[4] According to Luke, Jesus at the distribution of the wine spoke the words, Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου,[5] and the assurance that he would no more eat bread and drink wine preceded the distribution of the Supper. According to Paul, Jesus at the giving of the wine repeated the monition that the Supper was to be observed in memory of him.[6] It may be questioned which report is nearer to the original, Mark's or Paul's (Paul is Luke's authority). In Matthew, the multiplied forms of command and the addition of εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν clearly indicate amplifications. To the assertion of Paul that he received his knowledge of the Supper ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, too great weight must not be given, as by the words "from the Lord" he intended only to say that his account really went back to the Lord, — i. e. the Lord's institution was the source of his report,—just as elsewhere in the same manner he appeals to a λόγος κυρίου,[7] without meaning to be understood as having had a supernatural revelation. That he did not obtain that communication in consequence of such a revelation and of a special commission, is proved by his making no mention of an ἀποκάλυψις made to him or to his informant, but still more fully by his using the formula, ἐγὼ παρέλαβον, indicative of tradition as his authority. Peter, on the other hand, is undoubtedly the authentic indorser of the account in

[1] Matt. xxvi. 26. [2] Luke xxii. 19. [3] 1 Cor. xi. 24.
[4] Matt. xxvi. 27. [5] Luke xxii. 20. [6] 1 Cor. xi. 25.
[7] 1 Thess. iv. 15.

Mark, and there is internal evidence that this Evangelist comes nearest to the exact words of Jesus. Had Jesus said that the disciples were to repeat the Supper in remembrance of him, it would hardly have passed unnoticed by the elder tradition. It is much more probable that, after the Supper was once formally observed as a divine service by the Apostolic Christians, it was sought to justify this observance of it by an express command of Jesus. So also the more difficult formula in the distribution of the cup, Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης,[1] is to be preferred to the less difficult, Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι.[2] When, finally, Paul omits entirely the declaration of Jesus that he would drink no more of the fruit of the vine,[3] and adds of his own authority that the Lord's Supper was never to be observed without showing forth the Lord's death,[4] Paul's omission of the declaration is explained by its difficulty; but at the same time this difficulty is the surest pledge that the words in Mark are the original words.

30. p. 273. The Synoptics know nothing of the hearing which, immediately after his arrest in the garden, Jesus had before Annas, but according to their account he was led away to a preliminary examination before Caiaphas, the president of the High Council.[5] In the court of the Hall of Justice the denial of Peter took place (the fourth Gospel states it as having occurred in the court of the palace of Annas), and not until the morning was the decisive public sitting held. All attempts to reconcile the fourth Gospel with the synoptical account, especially by saying that the scene of the denial of Peter[6] is erroneously placed within the precincts of the palace of Caiaphas, are rendered unavailing by the fact that Jesus is stated to have been led away from Annas to Caiaphas much later.[7] To take the aorist ἀπέστειλεν in the passage referred to as a pluperfect is only

[1] Mark xiv. 24.
[2] 1 Cor. xi. 25.
[3] Mark xiv. 25.
[4] 1 Cor. xi. 25.
[5] Mark xiv. 53; Matt. xxvi. 57; Luke xxii. 54.
[6] John xviii. 15.
[7] John xviii. 24.

a poor expedient of the harmonists. We should rather approve of reading οὖν, with *Lachmann*, after ἀπέστειλεν, whereby the explanation of the aorist as a pluperfect becomes altogether inadmissible. According to the fourth Gospel, Jesus was not examined by Caiaphas, but was immediately sent by him to Pilate.[1] Further, as this Gospel states, sentence of death was not pronounced by the High Council upon Jesus, but only urgently sought from Pilate, who gave Jesus up to them to be crucified.[2] That Jesus was examined by a person who, like the High Priest Annas, exercised no official functions, who had been deposed by the Procurator Valerius Gratus, and was out of favor with the Romans, is not in itself very probable. That he was the supreme judge, and that the acting High Priest did not undertake such examination in his own person,[3] are both unfounded conjectures. It is much more probable that, in so weighty a matter, the presiding High Priest, in a grand sitting,[4] conducted in his own person the hearing, upon the result of which the issue of the affair essentially depended. Besides, the hearing before Annas, according to the fourth Gospel, led to no consequences whatever.[5] The idea of *Bleek*, that Luke also reports the hearing before Annas,[6]—whose person to be sure he mentions once, — and that, because the name of the High Priest conducting the examination is not given in the relation which Matthew made use of, Matthew erroneously thought it was Caiaphas,[7] rests upon the incorrect assumption that Mark copied the other two Evangelists. The greatest difficulty is in ascertaining why the fourth Evangelist was led to suppose that Jesus was examined by Annas and not by Caiaphas. The difficulty is not fully explained merely by supposing that the Evangelist desired to strengthen the evangelical evidence of the unbelief of the Jews by showing that *two* high priests had passed sentence of condemnation

[1] John xviii. 28.
[2] John xix. 16.
[3] Compare *Ewald*, Geschichte Christus, p. 472.
[4] Mark xiv. 53; Matt. xxvi. 57 *et seq.*
[5] John xviii. 19 – 23
[6] Luke xxii. 54.
[7] Synoptische Erklärung, II. p. 438.

upon Jesus.[1] The most probable idea is that the fourth Evangelist here followed the later tradition, current in Asia Minor, according to which *at the instigation of Caiaphas* the Sanhedrim had at an earlier period come to the conclusion which condemned Jesus to death.[2] Thus also is solved the enigma, that, according to the fourth Evangelist, neither on the night of the arrest nor on the following morning was any condemnation passed upon Jesus by the High Council, and that the examination of Jesus by Annas appears to have been without aim, or at all events could have served only for the information of Pilate.

31. p. 276. As, with the exception of Luke, no Evangelist mentions Pilate's sending Jesus to Herod, as also the older tradition, which Mark and Matthew follow, knows nothing of it, there arises no slight doubt of the historical credibility of the story. We do not see why the other Synoptics should not have mentioned so interesting an episode, had they been acquainted with it; neither do we clearly understand how so much could have taken place in the few hours of the day on which Jesus was crucified, — a full session of the High Council, the delivery of Jesus to Pilate, Pilate's examination of Jesus, the appeal to the people in behalf of the prisoner, the sending of Jesus to Herod, Herod's examination of Jesus, &c. The scene with Herod must at least have occupied several hours. The story certainly was not invented by the third Evangelist, but it was generated by the later Gentile-Christian tradition, and therefore further removed from the scene of the events of the history. The tradition took this direction from the same cause which is more distinctly visible in the fourth Gospel, namely, for the purpose of throwing upon Judaism and its representatives the chief guilt of the crucifixion of Jesus, and of relieving the representative of the Gentiles, Pilate, as much as possible of the responsibility. All cir-

[1] *Baur*, Kritische Untersuchungen, p. 268.

[2] John xi. 49 – 57.

cumstances considered, the story may rest upon the fact, that not only the Pharisees but also the Herodians were determined opposers of Jesus, and these, with Herod Antipas at their head, might, during the last abode of Jesus in Judea, have repeatedly discharged against him the arrows of their scorn, and rejoiced from their hearts at his condemnation and his crucifixion.

[In concluding a labor, which he has found full of interest, and which he trusts is to serve the Truth, the translator is free to confess that, with great respect for the learning and industry of German critics and commentators, he is struck with the fact that these eminent and laborious scholars appear never to perceive *that the records owe their existence to the reality of the facts recorded.* They search with wonderful acuteness for every shadow of a "dogmatic necessity," for every possible extrinsic consideration, in order to account for the telling of the story. They look everywhere but directly at the facts related, to solve the secret of their having passed into history. The facts of the Life of Jesus, — it is one of the translator's strongest convictions, — when once they are truly and distinctly apprehended, will be felt to be so full of life and power, that it would have been strange indeed if "many" (Luke i. 1) had not taken it in hand to record them, and if also, of the numerous early records that must have sprung into existence, such narratives as we now have in the Four Gospels had not lived on from age to age and proved themselves imperishable. — W. H. F.]

THE END.

Cambridge: Stereotyped and Printed by Welch, Bigelow, & Co.

THIS BOOK MAY BE KEPT
FOURTEEN DAYS
A FINE WILL BE CHARGED FOR EACH
DAY THE BOOK IS KEPT OVERTIME.

OCT 29 1984

DEMCO 38-293

CINCINNATI BIBLE COLLEGE & SEM. LIBRARY
232.9 v.2
main
Schenkel, Daniel/The character of Jesus
3 4320 00009 1621

232.9
S324c 32915
v. 2
Schenkel, Daniel
The Character of Jesus Portrayed

THE CINCINNATI BIBLE SEMINARY LIBRARY
A. No. 32915
D. D. No. 232.9
S324c
v.2

OEMCO